

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

MAY, 1851.

---

VOL. III.—NO. III.

---

THE VALUE OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

IN attempting to penetrate the spirit of American Institutions, to explain the phenomena, which they present, and to show the relative position of American civilization in the history of the world, it is improper to suppose that these things have taken place in some accidental manner,—that the outcasts of the old world, carried by some fortunate wind to the American shores, and favored by some undefined influence of our hills and vallies, our fountains and streams, commenced the superstructure of American culture, of American government, and American enterprise. So too it is equally as absurd to trace our American life to the noble spirits, that figured so extensively in our early history, as if it were owing to their originality, or powers of invention, that we have been made to occupy our present position in the history of the world. Our historic characters, or great men, and we have such as have made an impression on the world, were the embodiment of a spirit, that was not peculiar to them, but which was shared with them by others in distant lands; and how could they have been its originators? The time-spirit would disdain so recent an origin; it comes to us from afar, from the wreck of ancient, and venerated institutions; from the ruins of empires, from the tomb of former glory, and bears in its

VOL. III.—NO. III.

bosom all that is precious, or valuable,—every germ of life, that lingered in the remains of effete forms of humanity. The forces of history, extending from country to country, from age to age, meeting with inflexible opposition every strange element, overthrowing, establishing, or modifying, until the aspect of human affairs have undergone an entire change, may well throw the noise and uproar of human passion into the back-ground. As America is now admitted to have come into the general whole of history, it must have been called into existence by laws as necessary and unchangeable, as those which control the planets above, or the hidden powers below. If such a connection between our life and the past, can be made to appear, it will serve to enhance the value of our existence in the eyes of all intelligent persons, to encourage an enlightened patriotism, and to discourage a narrow-minded national vanity, that is springing up among us.

In the four celebrated empires of antiquity, the centralization of power, operated with almost omnipotent force, as if this were the vanishing point of human life. In the Roman Empire it received its highest development, when the known world was held beneath the sway of a single hand. When this latter colossus of human power began to crumble into atoms, it was succeeded by the rise of another idea, pointing in the same direction, which was exhibited in the papacy. Previously the tendency of the times was an objective one, but this objectivity was to be gained by external power as in the case of civil government. The world sought to be united in an external organization, and in this way to find its consummation. At the rise of the papacy this objective tendency continued, but began to move in a more spiritual and inward way. The idea of the age was to unite men by the established religion, by creeds, by an ecclesiastical organization and laws, over which the priesthood should exercise dominion. The reigning idea of the middle ages, consequently, was the establishment of the Catholic Church. No event of importance took place, which had not some connection, directly or indirectly, with the propagation of spiritual power in the bishop of Rome. This was supposed to be an all absorbing interest of men. Nothing was considered valuable, which did not subserve the purposes of the hierarchy. The pope, and the priesthood were the adoration of the multitude, and the source of all temporal and spiritual blessings. Civil government became subject to the spiritual power. Literature and Science were alike enslaved to the ruling idea. Authority, and not investigation, was the order of the day. A more subjective ten-

dency, that was manifested in different directions, claiming the rights of freedom, was driven to the mountains, or burnt with faggots. Private judgment was dispensed with ; the Pope was infallible, and Emperors bowed at his palace, and humbly supplicated his favor.

Now it cannot be said that such almost superhuman efforts after the unity of the race, did not carry within them some degree of relative justification. Had they not possessed some shadow of righteousness, they never could have been put forth. There remains in man, as a relic of his primitive condition, a feeling after unity with his fellows,—a dim intuition, that his present distracted and divided condition, is not the will of the Creator, and that when the golden age returns to bless the world, the present divisions of men shall be healed, and he shall be one with himself. In the heathen world this was doubtless a vague feeling, that mingled with a host of selfish motives and passions. In the Catholic Church it came into a clearer consciousness. Christianity had taught men, what they dimly felt, that unity was a duty, and one aspect of the sanctified condition of the world ; consequently, they believed they were doing God-service in the bitter persecution of the times,—in stifling the better tendencies that were beginning to appear, with the view of upholding the idea of unity. But their efforts, as in the case of the heathen, proved a failure.

The triumph of the Romish hierarchy was the beginning of its decay. The human mind had been carried to an extreme, and a reaction must ensue. This was witnessed in the Reformation of Luther. That energy, which had held the world in check, and by its all embracing grasp, subjected every opposing agency, seemed to stop of a sudden, and with a struggle, that shook every department of human activity, took an opposite direction. The love for the universal threatened to become an obsolete idea. Its corruptions, as it appeared in the hierarchy of Rome, became a stench in the nostrils of the world. The old passed away, and everything became new. As the church previously had been the centre of attraction, so now the individual became an object of wide-spread interest. Individual improvement and rights swayed in the contentions of the times. The new current in human affairs, moved forward, bearing down all opposition, sparing nothing, though sanctified by antiquity, and covered over with the most deeply interesting associations. The deluge of northern barbarians in their sanguinary course over the fields of ancient civilization, plundering, and defacing with a barbaric indifference every remain of a former state of things,

can scarcely be compared with the new influence, which the Reformation brought to bear on modern civilization. The mind of man freed from religious tyranny sought, in accordance with the laws of its own being, to realize this freedom in other departments of activity. Freed as it respects its relation to God, it could not long remain, on the score of mere consistency, a slave to man. This subjective tendency then has been the ruling power in history since the sixteenth century, and has to a greater or less extent, rendered every other interest, the church, the state, and cultivation in general, subject to its sway. Within the range of this new era, America, with its peculiar modification of life, stands forth in intimate connection with this newly established-world-influence.

Our intellectual life partakes as largely of the modern spirit, as our activity under any other aspect. In this country knowledge has doubtless increased, but mainly under the influence of the subjective influence already referred to. Every branch of knowledge has received attention, and the progress in what are called the sciences, for so youthful a country, is great indeed. There is, however, as great a want of unity in our intellectual pursuits, as there is in our political or religious existence. Sciences are studied as something separate and independent of each other, and no attempt is made to refer them to some central point, around which they are to revolve, and where they may be seen in their proper relation to each other. Different departments of knowledge are made to embrace separate spheres of existence, as if all existence did not form a whole, that cannot be separated without violence. Science and revelation are still made to oppose each other as well as elsewhere. This state of things has its cause in our European origin. In ancient times when other influences were operative, it was the aim of philosophers to bring all knowledge into a circle,—to harmonize its apparently jarring interests. This was the office of philosophy as something distinct from science, or the investigation of a particular branch of knowledge. Cicero calls it the parent of all the sciences.<sup>1</sup> In the speculations of Plato, different branches of knowledge are organized into a most beautiful system, all springing from a central unity. His system has always been admired for its comprehensiveness and compactness. He ruled in the in-

---

<sup>1</sup> Neque enim te fugit, omnium laudatarum artium procreatricem quandam, et quasi parentem, eam, quam philosophiam Graeci vocant, ab hominibus decussimis judicari.—*DE ORATORE.*



tellectual world, with the highest authority, for at least a thousand years, and among the most various and opposing systems, as it were by the magic of his name maintained his sway. From the ninth century, his scholar Aristotle, succeeded him in influence, whose system aims at a similar authority over the domain of knowledge, though it has been supposed to possess less unity. These attempts at philosophizing were to a great extent failures, which is no more than what might be anticipated under the circumstances. To have presented an organic system of knowledge, would have been as impossible, as to have written a perfect Geography of the world, before the discovery of America by Columbus. The subject-matter of knowledge had not as yet been traversed. There were continents that had not as yet been discovered. Revelation had not been made known, or it shone with but a glimmering light. But the object kept in view was right and proper. It is the aim of knowledge to reflect the universe around in the totality of its parts; the mind cannot rest satisfied, until it can see ideally the great world spread out before it; it is therefore unjust to condemn the ancient schools without a limitation. If they were inferior to us in details, they were superior to us in a more important respect. Under the subjective tendency of modern times, philosophy, or this general science, began to lose its credit more and more. In the Baconian system, there seems to be no room left for it at all. Indeed in his two celebrated tracts upon philosophy, it is his object to explode it altogether, and to substitute in its place, in the natural sciences at least, his method of induction. He discards all *a priori* reasoning as fallacious, and fruitful in errors. Under the influence of Locke, all intuitive notions or ideas are attempted to be forever banished from the sphere of science. The weight of these two names has been sufficient, to make their numerous disciples heartily doubt, whether there is such a thing as philosophy in the ancient sense of the term. By the great mass of English and American minds it is stoutly resisted. Its aid or assistance in the pursuit of knowledge, is entirely rejected. It is supposed to be the parent of all mental aberrations, and the errors of the ancient schools are all laid to its charge. In this country knowledge has increased, but as a general thing, under the influence of this foreign tendency. It is here as elsewhere fragmentary, and to a great extent divorced from religion, where it should find its centre. It is successfully used for the defence of error, and is often prostituted to the vilest purposes.

Our political life, for which we are often disposed to claim the credit of originality, is also intimately connected with influences, that were at work in Europe previous to our existence.

After the downfall of the empires of antiquity, civil power became an object of secondary importance in the world. Another interest, the Church of Christ, enlisted the affections of men. After the Roman Empire there arose no political power, worthy of being compared with it. The reign of Charlemagne was partial; it extended over but a part of the world, and at his death crumbled into ruins. It was succeeded by the Germanic Empire with youthful freshness under Otho. But during the thousand years of its duration, it had never arrived at any degree of compactness, and like its predecessor, was limited in its rule. Under Gregory VII, and Innocent III, it was subject to the spiritual power. In the case of all these struggles after political centralization, there was little else, but an aping after the empires of antiquity, a struggle after something, which was passing away. Under these circumstances the Reformation commenced its action upon the State. Government received a modification from the new tendency called forth in the religious world. It received a new aim, and began to be animated with a new life. Instead of being designed as an instrument for selfish purposes, for external grandeur and effect, it was directed, as in the case of religion, to the individual, and was required to elevate him in his social position.

In England more than in any other country, Politics was more evidently modified by the principles of the Reformation. The reformation of the church in this country was of a two-fold character. It was on the one hand conservative; it sought to accommodate the new form of faith to the established order of things. Henry VIII was willing to reform the English Church, provided it could be extricated from the power of the Roman See; further than this, he made little account of the principles of Luther. The views of Queen Elizabeth were of a similar character in regard to the reformation of the church. This state of things served to awaken on the other hand a more radical reformation, among the lower classes, who clamorously advocated not only the doctrines of Calvin, but also his system of church Government, which is the most perfect form of republicanism. Corresponding to these religious movements, we find reflected upon the outward world, similar political movements. It is sometimes thought that the rise of liberal principles in England during the seventeenth century, was owing to Puritan influence entirely, whilst their opponents were the advocates of despotism, and tyranny. Such a view, however, does injustice to history, as well as to the facts in the case. The Revolution of 1649 was doubtless occasioned by the leaven of Puritanism,

and Cromwell, who was at the head of it, stands in an inseparable historical connection with its religious tendency. But the Restoration under William, Prince of Orange, a born republican, with its accompanying blessings to England, was mainly owing to the enemies of Cromwell and his Puritan allies.

In France the republican tendencies of the Reformation, began to be manifested at an early period. But in this country, there were individuals at the helm of power, who could descry their influence at a distance, and make provisions to keep them there. With the politicians of France, Calvinism was synonymous with the overthrow of despotic power. They were consequently willing to bear upon their national character the disgrace of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the slaughter of St. Bartholomew's night, with their attending horrors, rather than to allow the silent operation of principles, which they felt must eventually overthrow their authority. But though France by dint of persecutions, the most hateful in the annals of time, succeeded in warding off to a certain extent the progress of religious, and with it civil freedom, she was obliged to yield at length to that power, which was moulding the destinies of the world. The progress of liberal principles had been checked, but not repressed. They came at length, but with what unexampled violence did they seize the nation! The French Revolution was the fruit of bigotry and intolerance. It came later than the English Revolution; it was also more violent, because the internal forces had been gathering for a longer period.

A similar improvement in the political condition of other nations in Europe might be noticed. But no where had the spirit of the age an opportunity to run its course in that part of the world. The genius of its ancient superstition and tyranny still lingered around its massive ruins, and awed the hand of the innovator, as he attempted to erect a structure after the modern style. Europe, covered over with the deeply interesting associations of the past, was not an arena for the display of a new world-historical power. It were a more easy matter to arouse ancient Babylon from the tomb of Empires, or cause Palmyra to smile again in her lonely desert, than to expect that she, crowded with memories of her ancient splendor, should have again resumed a youthful activity, and become the centre of a new civilization. It was but the other day that she disappointed the high-wrought expectations of many in this country, and now she bids fair to run through her cycle,—only to give room to more youthful nations to solve the problem of the world's destiny. For the exhibition of a new phasis of humanity, it seemed nec-

essary that some more congenial spot should be obtained. For this purpose America was discovered, and just about the time, when the spirit of the Reformation awoke.

Every where in this country progress in the political relations of man may be discerned,—improvements far in advance of the old world; yet every where the spirit now so active in Europe looks forth. Whilst we have our individual rights secured to us in an eminent degree, a onesided individualism is fearfully at work in both sections of the country. A process of disintegration is going on, that requires our united energies to resist. Division and distraction are the order of the day. Unity has so few attractions, that the constitution of our country, which asks but little sacrifice from the individual, meets with no approbation from some. The dangers to our country from the direction referred to, were pointed out by the acute De Tocqueville in his work on Democracy in America a few years ago, and subsequent experience has proved his observations to be just. During the political tempest through which the country has just passed, the tendency of our political life came to light. We seemed to be on the eve of returning to a complete atomic state. Still the principle of unity prevailed, showing that we have not entirely lost our regard for what is objective in politics, and giving us encouragement to believe, that our existence is not destined to result in what politicians call, a political blunder.

It is beginning to be regarded that American freedom sprung up from the germ deposited by the Pilgrim Fathers on the shores of Plymouth. This is usually the burden of speeches delivered at new England dinners. We meet with individuals in all parts of the Union, who speak of "our Pilgrim Fathers," though they have not a drop of Pilgrim blood coursing their veins; so that we might be led to suppose, that the heterogeneous population of this country, German, Irish, French, and Anti Puritanic, would by and by claim paternity at their hands. We think that other parts of the Union acted equally as prominent a part in the establishment of our Institutions, and deserve to be held in equal remembrance. It is but necessary to refer to Virginia, in order to substantiate the truth of this statement. The original settlers of Virginia were of quite a different mental complexion from that of the Puritans. They were for the most Englishmen, descendents of opponents of Cromwell, and represented a distinct tendency in the progress of civil liberty. So we might refer to Maryland, which was founded under Catholic auspices, where the spirit of liberty was ripe at the outbreak of the Revolution. Pennsylvania, which was settled mainly by persons of

German descent, was among the first of the states, that sought for political regeneration. If the genius of Puritanism was favorable to freedom and republican institutions, it was only so in virtue of the general spirit of the age, which it shared in conjunction with the other provinces. In Europe the tendency of the times in every direction was in favor of progress, improvement, and a general extension of individual liberty. The Reformation, whilst it has been the source of every thing great and good during the three last centuries, is also the parent of American freedom. Its influence was not confined to the religious world, in which it commenced,—it extended over the territories of science and politics. Infidels and sceptics were carried along by the same general current, blindly submitting in politics to what they rejected in religion. On this account the fact that some of the prominent men of our early history were irreligious men; and, indeed, infidels, cannot detract from the genuine value of our political superstructure. It is a merit of Bancroft's *History of the United States*, giving it at once a national value, that he endeavors to point out the different historical and religious tendencies, that were transplanted at an early date to the soil of the different states, and which subsequently combined to fight the battles of freedom.

It is not a difficult matter to present the points of union between our religious life and that of Europe. It was the merit of the Reformation, to bring forward into prominent light, the idea of christian freedom, in which, we, perhaps, pride ourselves more than did our ancestors. The Creeds and Theology of the Reformation are our most precious legacy. Indeed such has been the power of the ruling idea in this country, that the churches have run to excess, and in many directions ignored the principle of unity, which, however, is opposed to the spirit of the Reformation.<sup>1</sup> The words, unity and brotherhood, it is true, have some attraction, and some degree of power, but the thing itself is very much suspected. There is every where a desire for denominational unity, though every where it meets with serious interruption. But how far are we from being united as denominations into one universal christian church. The very idea is considered preposterous, and full of danger to our rights as citizens of the heavenly kingdom. Our political life is much better organized, than our religious life as a whole. It creates a glow of patriotism when the visitor stands in the galleries of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*.

the Capitol at Washington, and witnesses the nicely balanced machinery of our government,—working out the destiny of a country extending from Maine to California. He here meets the spirit of the nation standing forth in an objective form, and sees that our political life is a common one. If, however, he be of a religious cast of mind, he looks forward into futurity, and asks whether our religious existence shall ever gain some central point,—a heart which shall send out to the most distant extremities, the warm fluid of a common life. The children of this world are wiser in their generation, than the children of light.

Our historical connections and relations serve to give this country significance, and at the same time a relative value. If, as we have seen, with the germs of much that is good in the past, we have received much that is evil at the same time, America is not of yesterday, the growth of a night. It is not, as it is often represented the undutiful child, that never learned the first commandment with promise. So far as she has honored and obeyed her parent, she may expect that her days shall be long in the land which God has given her. The perpetuity of our Institutions is not so much dependent upon the abstract principles upon which they are based, or the measures, that are taken to uphold them, as their connection with the God of history, who is the only living and true God. The English Commonwealth after existing a brief summer-day fell, because it was the mock-creation of man; the first French Republic had a much briefer day, because it had a much more slender historical basis to stand upon. With all human organizations, as with individuals, obedience is the precursor of prosperity. The law is our school-master to bring us to Christ.

If to our historical advantages, we add the spirit of a chastened progress, our life will assume more and more an absolute value. The progress referred to, however, is not such a one as that in which the times have been rapidly carrying us. Freedom, civil and religious rights, individual progress are objects that may always engross our warmest affections; but what we most need at the present day is progress in the direction of unity. The precious inheritance lies at our doors, but it needs to be cultivated; it is still in a chaotic state, it needs to be protected, to be adorned, to bear the impress of an owner, before it can be called our property. The gold from the distant mines is ours; to become current it must pass through the mint, and bear a common image and superscription. No country upon earth, perhaps, possesses greater natural advantages than ours. Its location with reference to the old world is peculiar. With Eu-

rope and Africa on the east, and since the improvements in navigation, our next door neighbors; with Asia, the residence of ancient civilization on the west, our country would seem to be destined to occupy the centre-point of civilization, and to a fervid imagination, be the last link of influences in bringing about the glory of the latter-day, when the human race shall have attained its unity and consummation. Yet all the advantages of climate, soil, and geographical position are dependent upon the spirit, which is to rule in our people. Nature is entirely at the mercy of spirit. When the human world degenerates, the outward world becomes a wilderness and seems to sympathize with the moral desolation. To make the desert and the solitary place glad, and the desert to blossom as the rose, every thing depends upon the purification of our religious life. Its variegated tints, that now charm us so much by their brilliancy of color, must again be united to give us a pure light, which after all is most wholesome. Then knowledge and revelation will be reconciled, and philosophy become the hand-maiden of religion. Then politics and government will be purified, and the state become the servant of Christ; the Church, the Lamb's Bride, will have kings for her nursing fathers, and queens for her nursing mothers: and they shall bow down to her with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of her feet. Isaiah 49: 23.

*Mercersburg, Pa.*

T. A.



## CUR DEUS HOMO?

"It is oftentimes considered the chief purpose of Christ's Incarnation," says Trench (*Huls. Lect. p. 218.*) "that it made his death possible, that it provided him a body in which to do that which merely as God he could not do namely to suffer and to die; while some of the profoundest teachers of the past, so far from contemplating the Incarnation in this light, have rather affirmed that the Son of God would equally have taken man's nature, though of course under very different conditions, even if he had not fallen—that it lay in the everlasting purposes of God, quite irrespective of the fall, that the stem and the stalk of humanity should at length bear its perfect flower in Him, who should thus at once be its root and crown." This passage we have quoted before, in our notice of the work from which it is taken, as one of significant interest in relation to the great subject to which it refers.

In a later article we have called attention to a more full and formal presentation of the same view by Professor Liebner of Germany, who makes it in fact the foundation thought of his recent work on Christology. The view is adopted also by Dörner, and has called forth as we have seen the direct approbation of Schöberlein, in an able recension of Liebner's work published in Reuter's Repertorium. Liebner himself has appeared again, as we have also seen, in the same Journal, in opposition to Dr. Thomasius, a distinguished Lutheran divine, who it seems has entered the lists with him on the opposite side. This may serve to show the interest which is taken in the question here brought into debate, and how intimately related it is felt to be to the very heart of theology at the present time.

We find now a new writer on the field, Dr. Julius Müller, the author of the widely celebrated treatise on Sin. His mere name is sufficient of course to command attention and respect. He is not a man to take up any subject lightly, and what he writes is sure to carry with it the weight both of extensive learning and profound thought. This credit is well sustained by his dissertation on the subject before us, in two articles contained in Schneider's *Deutsche Zeitschrift* for October 1850, under the title: "The Question examined, Whether the Son of God would have become man, if the human race had continued without sin." The occasion of the discussion is in large part at least the work of Professor Liebner. It is not however a review of this in any strict sense, but addresses itself to the inquiry with

which it is occupied in a general way. The investigation is exceedingly calm, but at the same time exceedingly searching and deep, and the conclusion reached by it is a full negative answer to the question that forms its theme. The author allows a large merit to Liebner's work, and considers it an important contribution to theological science, especially in its view of the deep and difficult doctrine of the Trinity; but he rejects as unsound and unsafe the thought on which it rests throughout, that the necessity of the Incarnation lies primarily not in the fall of man but in his creation. Liebner of course, as we have before seen, does not call in question the soteriological design of the mystery, its relation to sin as the only possible means of redemption and salvation; he simply maintains, that this is not to be viewed as the exclusive or primary reason of the mystery, that there was a necessity for it on the contrary back of this, and of a far broader and deeper nature, in the original idea of humanity itself, in virtue of which only it was possible for the special need created by the fall to find its remedy and cure here under any such supernatural form. But Müller refuses to acknowledge any necessity for the Incarnation, beyond the existence of sin and the idea of redemption. The soteriological interest forms in his view the ultimate and whole reason of the stupendous mystery; so that if the first Adam had not fallen, there would have been no second Adam to take his place, if sin had not entered into the world the Son of God would never have assumed human flesh.

Some traces of the other view, according to Müller, are to be met with in the Patristic Period, particularly in the writings of Irenaeus; but it is among the Schoolmen of the middle ages that it first comes distinctly and formally into view. Anselm of Canterbury, in his celebrated tract, *Cur Deus Homo?* excludes it, by referring the Incarnation wholly to the necessity of an atonement for sin; and Thomas Aquinas rests in the same conclusion, as most in harmony with the authority of the Scriptures, although he seems occasionally to look a different way, and has been quoted in fact by some as the patron of the other opinion. On the other hand a certain abbot Rupert, a theologian of decidedly biblical rather than scholastic turn, appears in the 12th century as the open advocate of the view, setting it in what he conceives to be necessary connection with Augustine's theory of predestination. After his time, a number of the schoolmen are found answering the question, *Cur Deus homo?* in the same general way; as for instance Alexander Hales, John Duns Scotus, and his school. "With this last his Pelagianizing anthro-

pology may have come here somewhat into play, inclining him to detract from the weight of sin as a determining influence on God's counsels; but the immediate reason he urges in favor of the view is, that the happiness and glory to which Christ's soul has been predestinated is a Divine purpose which in the order of dignity goes before the purpose of salvation towards other souls, on which account the Incarnation, as being the necessary condition of its realization, cannot in the order of God's purposes depend on the fall of man absolutely as its cause. Were this the case, it would seem to follow that Christ must be regarded as a *bonum occasionatum*, something which Duns Scotus takes to be wholly derogatory to the proper glory of his nature." We find the same view earnestly maintained again by the celebrated John Wessel, and still also under the same general regard to the dignity of Christ's person, as infinitely transcending even in his human nature the worth of all human beings besides.

With the Reformers of the 16th century the sense of sin was so active, and along with this the idea of redemption so prominent and strong, that the question, whether the Son of God would not have assumed flesh even if man had never fallen, may be said to have had no power even to engage their serious attention. At all events they could have for it but one answer. The mystery of the Incarnation depends for them on the tragedy of Sin. If pressed with the difficulty of upholding the absolute sovereignty of God's decree they are ready in favor of this view to take refuge even in supralapsarianism, and to include the fall itself in the decree as the condition of redemption. So Calvin, as we all know, without any sort of qualification or reserve. But Luther when necessary looked at the matter in the same light. Even in his Larger Catechism he says: "*Ob id ipsum nos creavit Deus, ut nos redimeret,*" God created man in order to his redemption—a proposition which implies that the act of creation must have carried in it a provision for that which makes redemption necessary, in other words must have involved the necessity of sin. A public representative indeed of the other view of the necessity of the Incarnation, comes before us in this age in the person of the Lutheran Osiander. But this advocacy stood connected with what was considered an unsound theology on the subject of justification, which caused it of course to have more weight against the view in question than in its favor. The case was made still worse for it, by its gaining the approbation of Faustus Socinus; though with him again the reason for receiving it lay in a particular peculiarity of his own system which the hypothesis happened to fit, rather than in the older

theological speculation. "Thus it happened," says the writer before us, "that a theological opinion which had been considered in the middle ages open for free discussion in the schools, fell everywhere with the older Protestant theology into the reproach of heterodoxy. The orthodox divines of the Lutheran confession, so far as they touch the question, declare themselves with one voice against it. Still this has not prevented the later theology from looking favorably on a view, which is felt to be recommended especially by the consideration, that the highest act of Divine love, bringing with it the greatest exaltation of man, cannot be regarded as dependent upon man's wilful self-perversion, and so on something accidental, but must rest on the original pure idea of the creation in the Divine mind, or in other words on the *essential relation between God and man.*"

The investigation here in hand has to do with its subject, only as presented on the ground of the true Bible doctrine of a personal God. Pantheistic systems, which resolve the activity of God's love into a metaphysical process of absolute self-consciousness, made complete at last through the speculative thinking of the human spirit, have also appropriated to themselves the thought now in question; but their meaning is simply, that man is formed by his nature to become divine or theanthropic, in which view the entire history of the race is to be regarded as a so called eternal incarnation of the Deity. All such logico-metaphysical blasphemy is here left entirely out of sight. Supposing the Incarnation to be necessary even for a normal development of our human life, it is regarded as flowing only from an *ethical* principle or ground, from an act of the personal God; in the case of which any *necessity* it may have must rest wholly on the freedom of the Divine will, the disposition of God's love to reveal itself under such form.—So also no regard is had to those theories of an original necessity for the Incarnation, which shrink not from making it to be the completion of God himself, the higher unity, as they say, in which the contradiction of the pretended abstractions, Deity and Humanity, is brought to an end (*aufgehoben*). Such a view gives the mystery indeed the character of absolute necessity, not for man only but also for God; but it completely destroys in doing so the true idea of the absolute, and gives us under the name of an eternal Divine incarna-

---

<sup>1</sup> So Bonaventura speaking of the two different theories says: "Quis autem horum (modorum) alteri praeponendus sit difficile est videre pro eo, quod uterque modus catholicus est et a viris catholicis sustinetur."

tion the absurdity of an *absolute coming to pass*. This excludes too the conception that the Son of God or the Logos became flesh; the assumption is that *God became flesh*; an idea which implies a rejection of the christian doctrine of the Trinity, and resolves the whole being of God into a process. Christian science should be on its guard thus against even the sound of anything like an agreement with such a view; a caution, Müller thinks, which has not been sufficiently observed in certain quarters of the later German theology, where a disposition has been shown to transplant not merely the sound but the actual substance of the false idea in question to the historical field of the Bible. The idea of course has the whole voice and spirit of the New Testament against it; while it inevitably subverts besides the conception of God and that of the creature both at once. "The being of God would in this view fall fully into the course of time; up to a certain point in time he could not have been true and perfect God; and so could not be this either after such date; for an absolute which has come to pass is no less a contradiction, than one eternally coming to pass. Since moreover there could be no incarnation of the Logos without created existence, it would follow that God needed the world in order that he might truly be God; he creates it accordingly, to bring himself into full reality—that is, he does not create it at all, for the idea of creation implies essentially freedom over against the world, which is here supposed to be wanting; in the world, which all sound theism owns to be the creature of God, he must at the same time see the *condition of himself*, and Angelus Silesius would be right with his impiously bold word:

Gott ist so viel an mir, wie mir an ihm gelegen;  
Ich helf sein Wesen ihm, er hilft mir meines hegen.

Propositions such as the necessity of God's becoming man to complete his own nature, and the consequences that flow from it, may have some intelligible meaning on the platform of pantheism; but when transplanted to theistic ground they lose all sense and force, and deceive with a mere show of depth that comes only of the dim uncertain twilight in which they involve the mind. If they cannot satisfy it they at least put it into a state of confusion, and that itself is for many a sort of inward satisfaction."

The question then regards properly no conception of this kind, as the ground of the necessity for the Incarnation; but supposes the case to be, that such necessity is referred only to the *human*

side of the transaction ; in the sense namely, that it is *man* only who could not truly fulfil his own idea, the sense of his own nature, without the entrance of the Logos in a real way into the organism of his life.

Here comes into consideration the posture of Schleiermacher's theology with regard to the point in hand. Thomasius makes this the source in fact of the modern form of the proposition, that the Son of God would have become incarnate even if man had not sinned. But Müller shows very clearly that it has no root in Schleiermacher's theory whatever. According to this theory, Christ is the completion of human nature, the second stage of man's creation as distinguished from the first in Adam (*Glaubenslehre* §. 89.). The first creation is imperfect, through a want of full harmony in the nature of man between his conscience and will, the consciousness of God not being strong enough to give the spirit its proper supremacy over the flesh ; in Christ first this consciousness with its corresponding power appears in full force ; and from him, through the action of faith directed towards him by his people, it is brought to extend itself to the race generally, completing thus the original sense of our human life, and setting it free from its previous imperfection. Creation and redemption here are only different parts of one work. In this view, it is plain, that there is no room for the question, whether the Incarnation would have been necessary if man had not sinned. For what the system takes for sin is in truth a mere natural defect in the first form of man's being itself, which from the first looks forward to the higher consciousness of Christ as its own needful complement and end ; and this itself must be regarded of course then as the only normal order which the case allows. Or if it should be imagined that there might have been, according to the theory, such a progress of the first imperfect life of the race as would not have been attended with that inward contradiction and disturbance which we now experience under the notion of sin, it is easy to see that in such case there could be no room for the introduction of a higher order of existence in a single personal Christ as the means of redemption for others. In every view clearly, the system of Schleiermacher implies that the mystery of the incarnation is conditioned by the imperfection of the world as it now stands, and knows no ground beyond this or aside from this on which to speak of it as necessary.

We come thus to Müller's second article, with the question disentangled from all false connections, and reduced to its proper theistic and truly christian form. Admitting the existence of a

personal holy God, the perfect freeness of his acts, the original sufficiency of the first creation, the awful reality of the fall as something made necessary only through man's will, and the need of a real redemption by Christ's death, the thesis under consideration still asserts, that the mystery of the incarnation does not depend absolutely on this abnormal course of things, but would have had place also on the supposition of a normal or sinless development of man's life. It is allowed that the entrance of sin rendered it necessary for the mystery to take the special soteriological character under which it now appears; but the idea is, that back of this particular need there lay a broader and deeper necessity for it in the original creation of man's nature itself, which would have required it to make this in full what it was designed to be even if it had remained true to its first state. This is the thought to be examined and tried.

The older advocates of the opinion endeavored to rest it on direct scriptural proof. Its modern friends however see and acknowledge, that the Bible everywhere refers the fact of the incarnation to sin and the necessity of redemption. In other words it proceeds throughout on the simply soteriological theory, without any distinct regard to the other. It is not necessary to quote particular texts in proof of this. They meet us on all sides; while only three or four, such as 1 Cor. xv: 45-47, Eph. i: 21-23, Col. ii: 10, 1 Peter iii: 22, and as more plausible than all the rest Col. i: 16-17, are made to look by circuitous and doubtful interpretation the other way. But why, it is asked, may we not admit along with this direct biblical view, another also of more comprehensive character, growing forth from the power of legitimate and necessary speculation exercised on the vast scheme of christian truth as a whole? Thus related the two theories do not exclude each other. Rather the biblical representation is to be taken simply as a determinate phase of the truth, which is embraced in the other more general construction. The first proceeds analytically, planting itself on the fact of man's state as it now is; the other moves synthetically, in just the opposite direction. The last has to do with the general or universal substance of the relation in question; while the Bible, answerable to the actual condition of the world, brings into view a *specific mode and form* of its realization, namely the Word made flesh in order to the exhaustion of man's curse by suffering and death.

But this imagination of the possible harmony of the two theories, according to our author, is attended with great difficulties. Take first, for instance, that which starts from the *need of re-*



*demption.* The theory involves not merely single biblical texts, but the whole view that is taken of Christ's person, and of its relations to the world both before and since. "Our earthly human life as it now stands is directly and unavoidably subject to suffering; the soteriological view of the incarnation affirms of course that the entrance of the Son of God into this whole form of existence presupposes sin, and by it alone becomes intelligible. The same theory presses the consideration moreover, that in assuming flesh the Logos has been born as a member of the Jewish nation, and in subjection to its law, while the whole Israelitish economy resulted certainly from the fact of the fall. Only in view of sin again, it is urged, does it become intelligible why the incarnation took not place at the beginning of man's history, but at a later time; sin must first ripen, and humanity show what it was able to do of itself after the fall, before the Son of God could appear as the author of redemption and the dispenser of a higher life. And who can doubt, the soteriological theory is ready to add, but that all this is according to the sense of the Apostles, and particularly of that one among them, who alone has left us in his writings the outline of a general view of the world with Christ for its centre?" The mode too in which we are brought to participate in Christ's life, is such as to involve in its very nature the supposition of sin. Not only is this the case with repentance, but also with faith in the sense of Paul and John. Suppose no opposition between the natural and spiritual, the world of sense and the invisible world, in man's soul, and what room would there be for the idea of faith, as the power that breaks through the one to embrace the other? What room would there be for the conception of that agency of the Holy Ghost, which is represented to be now the medium of Christ's life and work in the world since his return to the Father? But how can we think of any such opposition between the two worlds in question, the soteriological theory asks, without the entrance of the disturbing power of sin into the process of man's life?

As regards the *work* of Christ again, the soteriological view will not consent of course to hold itself simply to the idea of the priestly office; as though the prophetic and kingly offices were to be properly cared for, as some have pretended, only by the other theory. It finds full scope for both these last in its conception of the kingdom of God, which is based on the fact of the fall and destined to end as a new creation in the glories of the resurrection. The three offices are in truth subordinated throughout to the idea of *redemption*.

"Thus it is that the theory which finds the cause of the incarnation in sin and the need of salvation, spreads itself out over the entire compass of the fact as it appears in history, over Christ's person and work, beginning and end, mode of revelation time, national sphere, all going before as preparation and all following after as consequence; no room is left anywhere for any other principle to appropriate to itself any part or portion of the fact; the actual incarnation is taken up by its explanatory account at all points, so as completely to thrust aside that other theory of an original general necessity for it as a purely vague and empty abstraction."

The same want of inward agreement between the two views will be felt, if we reverse the order of consideration and start with the opposite principle, that namely which places the christological necessity back of sin in the general nature of man.

The idea is, that if the development of humanity had gone forward in a perfectly normal and sinless way the Logos would still have become flesh. But for what end? Not for show merely, or to please the imagination. It must be thought of under an ethical view, as Liebner himself is careful to allow; it must be regarded as an act of *love* on the part of God. To whom? Of course to the human race. What would it communicate then; what want of the race would it propose to supply?

Here the ground is taken, that the race could have no true unity or wholeness without the God-man, that if its parts are not to fall asunder atomistically it must have a *personal head*, in whom the human nature is joined with the divine. This cannot mean merely, that Christ is appointed for all mankind as their ruler, and all mankind for him to submit to his government, that they belong of right to him and he to them; for so much the soteriological view itself allows, which is taken to fall short of the principle here in hand. Christ's headship over the race then must be understood of an *actual relation* holding between it and himself; as the New Testament also in truth refers the sense of *κεφαλή* only to a relation of this sort. Thus then a predicate, which is used of Jesus Christ commonly in his relation to the *Church*, is here transferred to the relation he bears to mankind in general, an application it never has in the Scriptures. But what does it signify in the first relation? Nothing less, certainly, than that he is joined in real life union with his Church, so as to be its ruling and actuating principle, filling it with his presence, and using it as the organ of his will, by the power of the Holy Ghost. But now extend this conception to the race as

a whole, and what becomes of the reference of the incarnation in any view to the idea of sin? Humanity then, sin or no sin, as being already in union with the divine-human life, needs no redemption. It has by this real relation all that it requires, and it becomes idle indeed to speak of sin as in any sense a fall from God; since in the midst of it all the race still stands, through its actual head, in full fellowship with God, and in full possession also of eternal life. What room can there be in such circumstances for the idea of redemption, or for making it in any way the object of the incarnation?

Each of the views in question then, it appears, goes actually to exclude the other. They refuse to stand together. It follows, that to maintain itself at all the idealistic theory, which pretends to resolve the mystery into a deeper general ground back of the soteriological view, must quit this abstract position, and come forward as the only sufficient key for the explanation of the whole fact.

In this case however one feature of it at least must still be excepted, the Saviour's *death upon the cross*. Not to refer this wholly to sin, would be to contradict plainly the whole sense of the Scriptures. But it is not easy to uphold the propitiatory significance of this death, if we are to retain steadily the thought that the God-man is the real head of the whole human race. It seems the most ready course to say, that the intervention of sin made it necessary for the head of the race to appear under such a form as should include, in addition to the requirements of the idea under its normal character, the provision of an atonement for the removal of the guilt belonging to men by means of suffering and death. But to say nothing of the isolated position the atonement is thus made to take in the general revelation of Christ, the force of it as a real condition of reconciliation with God cannot stand, where it is firmly held that Christ is the actual head of all mankind, and so still less of course the necessity of the incarnation for any such end. The death of the Son of God then must be taken as having a declarative value only, suited to assure men that their original and essential relation to their ever living head remains good notwithstanding their sense of guilt. Such a declaration might have been given by word alone; but it is rendered more expressive through the real symbol thus exhibited in the transaction of the cross. How every such view tends to sink the central mystery of faith into the form of a mere accommodation to human fancy and conceit, stripping it of all objective necessity and so of all real inward power, it is not necessary here to prove. It falls in truth into

the sphere of certain well known rationalistic theories, which are fairly exploded on the field of true theology.

Will it be said, to avoid this difficulty, that the idea of Christ's natural headship of the race anticipates and presumes of course a real appropriation of his atonement, on the part of men, by repentance and faith, and so cannot be regarded as having force till this condition is at hand? But if the thought in such form is not to lose itself in the mere conception of Christ's destination for the race at large, which belongs to the other theory, it must imply evidently the restoration of all men to communion with God as the metaphysically necessary end of all human development, and so along with this the overthrow in full of the ideas of freedom, accountability, guilt, punishment and pardon; and what becomes then of the real appropriation of the atonement through repentance and faith?

Or may it be supposed perhaps, that a part of mankind by its wilful resistance to the attraction of the head sunders itself from the body that belongs to it? So Liebner would seem to think, when he speaks of the loss of the wicked as "compensated" by the head, in which is realized the full idea of humanity. But this in one view is plainly to fall back into the scriptural thought, that Christ is the head of the *Church*; for the system of humanity as such is made to give way in favor of the body of the redeemed, to which only, and not to the race at large, the term *σῶμα* is applied in the New Testament. In this way the idealistic account of the incarnation would yield in truth to the soteriological. In another view however one cannot see, why the supposed capacity of Christ to compensate for the loss of a *part* of the race, should not be sufficient also to compensate if need be for the *whole*—a result certainly as anti-soteriological as possible. Then the last sense of his revelation, would be not his love towards actually existing men, but the perfect realization of the full idea of humanity in himself! But what becomes then of the *ethical* motive already acknowledged, as lying at the ground of the mystery? The thought besides dialectically destroys itself; for a head in which the whole idea of the body is already realized, so that it can by itself make good any deficiency in this whether partial or total, is by such character raised above the relativity that belongs to the very conception of the head.

Paul found all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge in Jesus Christ *crucified*. If the theory before us is to be more than an empty abstraction, as before said, it must be able, aside from this idea of the cross, to explain the other aspects and connections of the historical incarnation, as related to the world both

before and since. Can it do this? Liebner seems to think so; for on the ground that the idea of humanity is supposed absolutely to require a perfect realization in one central individual, free from all the onesidedness that must attach to other individuals as such, he bases the conclusion that mankind *in any case*, that is even without sin, could be righteous before God only by faith in Christ, their divine human head. "But now when Liebner himself expressly says at the same time, that this absolutely universal individual cannot belong originally to humanity, but must proceed from a higher sphere, how shall we understand it in the first place that the race should be found from the start, not by its own apostacy from God but by God's creative act, in a condition of perfect inability to meet the Divine requirement, without the implantation of a new principle higher than the nature of humanity as such? How again is the consequence to be avoided, that God in the first act of creation purposely made the world bad, in order to make it better in the second? And if we attend to it, this unavoidable insufficiency of all human individuals aside from the God-man as their universal centre, this want of righteousness in virtue of which they *cannot* be the objects of the Divine complacency, rests on no other ground than this, that as abstractions of the true ideal unity which is reached in Christ they are of course onesided and partial representations only of the real generic conception, and so necessarily inadequate examples of humanity. This itself then unfits us to stand before God in our natural state, that we are only *individuals* in the common metaphysical sense of the term! We have here a questionable mixing of the ethical and the metaphysical, from which it is only a step to the error current among the disciples of the Nature-philosophy of Schelling, that individuality is itself the principle of evil, the original fall from the absolute or God."

All goes indeed to subvert the very idea of sin. For if the abstract singleness of the human person taken by itself is itself evil, since the whole creation besides looks to this as its end, it follows that evil is identical with the conception of a finite creation; or rather in place of a creation the ground of relative existence is made to be, as in the old Gnostic systems, a falling away from God; whereby at last the ethical force of sin is wholly swallowed up in theosophico-metaphysical dreams. Or without this, if it be assumed in any view that the world as it came originally from God could not please him, how must the idea of sin suffer and along with it the whole view of salvation! It can hardly be taken at best to signify more than an aggravation of

defects previously inherent in the creature as such. The relation between normal and abnormal becomes one of difference, not in principle, but only in degree. How easily thus may the sense of our own sin mingle itself with the sentiment of mere natural insufficiency before God, and in this lose itself altogether! Such is the mischief always of trying to fix ethical predicates on metaphysical relations which are independent of will and freedom, with the view of thus transforming them into an ethical character; the transformation strikes unavoidably the other way, the ethical notions are lost in the simply metaphysical.

The origin of Liebner's confusion here is carried back by our critic to a metaphysical thought, which has captivated others also too far, he thinks, on the same ground; this namely, that the relation of *genus* and *individual*, and the postulate from it of one representing in metaphysical sense the life of the whole, is made the point of departure for the speculative construction of the christology. The thought, in the opinion of Müller, is only a delusive phantom, with associations and tendencies besides that may well cause it to be regarded with distrust. The adequate actualization of humanity in the person of the Son of Man, did not require that he should include in himself all particular talents and properties of the race, any more than it required that he should enter into all human relations and connections. His life was revealed under natural limitations, as of sex, nationality, family, &c. True, these particularities, essential to the truth of his human nature, were at the same time surmounted and as it were set aside by the greatness of his vocation and spirit. But this is something very different from the supposed concentration metaphysically of all the constituents of the total race in him, as the central individual and microcosm of humanity.

But now taking the thought in its true sense, that the moral idea which humanity carries in itself requires its adequate realization in the form of individual life, how will it bear on the proposition, that the Son of God would have become incarnate if there had been no sin? The thought itself contains nothing that looks to the realization of this ideal only in one single individual. Rather it requires it of all; for not to strive after it would be a positive falling away from morality, and the imagination of an endless striving that can never reach the end, a vain *progressus in infinitum*, is a contradiction that destroys itself. It lies however in the very nature of the *moral idea*, that the *nisus* in question should be directed towards the *whole* realiza-

tion of this idea if it is to have place in the mind at all; for the idea is based on man's relation to God, and is for this reason superior to all conditions and circumstances besides. Artistic, scientific, political ideals have quite another character. Their realization calls everywhere for a division of work into different spheres; even the most prominent minds here are the bearers and organs only of some distinct part of the idea. So the greatest musical genius may have no sense whatever for works of sculpture and painting, or the reverse. But in the realization of the *moral* idea, there is no room to speak of any such division of tasks in the service of the whole. The aim must be all or nothing. The object of redemption accordingly, now that sin has turned the race aside from its original destination, is to bring to pass the adequate realization of this idea in all that are gathered by it into the kingdom of God. But suppose sin had not occurred; then the idea must have actualized itself to the full in all human individuals—which is indeed implied also by the hypothesis of a normal development; and thus the thought before us by no means leads to the necessity of the incarnation for the realization required.

New difficulties in the way of the theory under consideration come into view, when we take into account the existence of other created intelligences besides men, either angels or the inhabitants of other planets. "If it lies in the conception of created personality universally, that its complete destiny can be reached only through the real union of the Logos with its nature, we must assume, (against Heb. ii: 16 indeed,) that such a mystery has had place also in favor of the angels. But it belongs to the very idea of a true incarnation that the Logos enters as subject into the process of an individual human life throughout; and if he is not to lose his personal unity in thus going out of himself this can have place only in one individual. United with two or more, he would not be truly in any with his actual self, but the union must be thought of merely as a sort of prophetic inspiration—the Logos simply working upon the created consciousness, without identifying himself with it and so without personal conjunction. Or else we must imagine a succession of personal unions—like the Hindoo avatars of Vishnu for instance, in which the deity takes the forms of different creatures and drops them again one after another. But this conception also plainly destroys the truth of the incarnation; for to this the permanence of the union is indispensable, since the truth of man's being implies continued existence. Pantheistic systems indeed, if they admit the hypothesis of other orders of personal beings



beside men, can easily enough extend to them *their* idea of the incarnation, the process by which God takes form in the world; this however, just because they allow no real incarnation in the christian sense, as a free act of love on the part of the Son, emptying himself of his glory for the purpose, but turn this thought into a vague shallow generality that has no power to bring man an inch nearer to the living God. Christian knowledge owns only one incarnation of the Logos in the person of Jesus Christ alone, and must reject with like decision every transfer of the conception, whether it be to other human persons or to beings of a different race."

But how now is the restriction of this condescension to the case of the *human* race to be explained? According to the soteriological theory, by its special need of redemption; it is the lost sheep, over against the ninety and nine which are left behind for its rescue, Matth. xviii: 12; the good angels are supposed to require no similar grace for their perfection; while the fallen angels are regarded as too deeply lost to be capable of any redemption. But take the other view, by which the incarnation is supposed necessary without sin; what reason then can be given for this restriction? No other it would seem than this, that the human nature in itself considered stands nearer to the Divine nature, to the Logos, than all created intelligence besides. It is preferred thus, not for its moral misery and want, but for its metaphysical excellence and worth. The transaction serves not so much to magnify the riches of Divine grace, as to illustrate the comparative dignity of the human race.

Unless however we reason in a circle from the mere fact of the distinction itself, which it is pretended to account for by its means, this fancy is found destitute of all biblical proof. The angels are styled also sons of God; they stand in near union with him, more close at present certainly than that to which man is admitted; they excel man in knowledge; the state of the resurrection is even described expressly as being "like unto the angels." In the view of the Bible thus, the image of God in which man is said to have been created is not peculiar to him, but belongs to all personal beings; as indeed the idea of their personality itself implies. Nay, the deeper fall of the lost angels would seem to show that their first state was higher than the original condition of man; which in fact the whole christian world has always believed.

The human race, we may believe, has indeed a great and wide end to serve in the general economy of creation; not however as standing higher than other personal intelligences, but as

standing comparatively lower. According to our author, the very extremity of the case, and the difficulty of the conditions involved in it, would seem to be that which invests the work of redemption here with its special significance and interest. Sin itself becomes thus the occasion of such a display of Divine love as could not otherwise have place. This redounds to the distinction of the human race; and as it is the *human nature* that is glorified by its union with the Logos, in the work of redemption, he is to be regarded as standing to this nature in a relation of special intimacy and appropriation; in such way that the glorification of the redeemed is always a process of conformation to the image of the God-man, a partaking of his glory, the entrance into them of Christ's being and life. Redemption is more than the simple restitution of man's primitive integrity; what we gain in Christ is something incomparably greater than what we have lost in Adam.

Here however we are bound to use great caution, that the relation in question be not so taken as to break down the conception of the true and proper boundary, that must ever hold necessarily between the nature of the creature and that of the Creator. The principle of man's union with God is *love*; which implies full personal distinction, and here also distinction of substance or essence. If such union overthrew the substantiality of the creature, causing it to lose itself in the Divine substance, it would be in truth no union but only destruction. God's love then would be in its action like hatred, absorbing or annihilating its object. The view which assumes the necessity of the incarnation independently of sin, Müller thinks, is particularly exposed to the danger of falling into this unethical apprehension of the nature of our relation to Christ; according to which, man is to be regarded as coming to a sort of deification, an actual unity of *essence* with the Logos, in virtue of his humanity. Every such imagination of course, whether it be open or latent only and disguised, reduces the existence of the creature to a mere unsubstantial show, and ends necessarily in the yawning gulph of pantheism.

"But, now, if according to all that has been said the theory of the original necessity of the incarnation cannot be maintained, what view must we take of the *idea of the God-man*, beyond which certainly no higher idea is to be thought of as the *εἶδος* of the Divine scheme of the world, and which therefore must necessarily be the central idea, around which all the other parts of creation revolve, as they find in it also their union and end? Does not the Apostle Paul say expressly in this sense,

Col. i: 16, 17, that the universe is created in Christ and for him, and that by him all things consist?

"Here different points of view are usually blended together, which need to be kept distinct.—So much the soteriological theory of the incarnation also must hold for settled, that Christ is the turning point of history, that the cross on Golgotha is the boundary where its centrifugal tendency became centripetal. Was the first Adam the commencement only of a process of natural life, which through the force of sin became a constantly growing departure from God; the second Adam is the author of a process of spiritual life, which rests in no end short of complete fellowship with God, 1 Cor. xv: 45 f. But the thought before us goes beyond this; it means that humanity, and so the world at large, has been originally formed with reference to the God-man and to union with him and under him as a head. Here also there is at bottom a deep truth, which is only half misunderstood. The end of all created life as it lies in God's mind, ideally viewed must be placed in such a free union of the personal creature with him, as shall cause it to be in full the organ of God, filled and glorified with his life, and as shall enable it, in virtue of the perfect holiness and bliss to which it is thus raised, to raise the rest of the creation also, after its way and measure, into a participation of the glorious liberty of the children of God. This world of personality, however, thus united with God, is in his eternal idea viewed as a whole, made up of manifold individuals joined together complementally as its members, and so as a kingdom of created intelligences, which as such remain substantially distinct from God, while he is in them still as all in all. The Logos now, as the absolute image of the Father and the hypostatical principle of his self-revelation *ad extra*, stands with all beings created in the image of God, that is with all personal creatures, in deep specific correspondence. As this principle he is the bearer of the Divine idea of the world, which comes to its focus in the conception of created personality; and in such view he is also the Mediator of all these intelligences as actually existing, Mediator in a universal sense that must be carefully distinguished from the soteriological, the Revealer of God for them in a purely inward way and by virtue of his dwelling in their spirit, and the sovereign king who conducts their history to its absolute end and completion; for only in communion with God can man, or any personal creature, rise to communion with God, whether directly or in the way of return from sin. Here we have in view the normal development of created personality, and in this sense it is undoubtedly true, that

man in his very origin is formed for Christ, namely as the Logos. The human nature is primitively disposed for the incarnation, just as all created personality is so in being made for communion with God. What since the fall the Holy Ghost is now for humanity in the sphere of redemption, and what before this redemption took place the Logos never ceased to be for the same humanity, though only as a light shining in darkness, that he would have been for it entirely and in full if it had gone forward without the disorder of sin; so that in this sense also the Holy Ghost is the representative of Christ, (John xiv: 16, xvi: 7,) here of course as the Logos. And thus all that is truly noble and great in antiquity, in which a higher inspiration comes into view pushing aside for the moment the narrow interests of selfishness, is to be referred to the immanent operation of the Logos as its source; some sense of which indeed we have even in that memorable word of the earnest Roman philosopher: *Nemo vir magnus sine afflatu divino unquam fuit.* Now however, since the entrance of redemption, all true elevation, in the case of man, springs from the Holy Ghost, and so stands inseparably connected with the pursuit of holiness, with the consciousness of personal sin and strenuous endeavors to be delivered from its power."

The passage, Col. i: 15-17, refers to this primitive relation to the Logos, and not to what he is for the world by the incarnation. This is implied by the title *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, the first-born of the whole creation. In this view it is also, that Christ in his state of exaltation, having again the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, John xvii: 5, is described by the apostles as Lord and Head, not only of the Church, but also of the angels in their various classes and orders; comp. Eph. i: 21, Col. ii: 10, 1 Peter iii: 22, and the *ἀνακεφαλαιῶν* Eph. i: 10.

If this view of the ideal order of the world in the Divine mind be correct, all else becomes *means* for carrying it out to its appointed end. These are conditioned, in the everlasting omniscience of God, by the vast and mighty disorder which has been brought into the world by sin. The reality of this is so fearful, the catastrophe it involves so great, that to meet it properly required on the part of Divine love not merely a slight modification of its plan as arranged to proceed without sin, but the introduction of a new provision, the most wonderful invention of this love, the awfully glorious mystery of the incarnation. This takes its place thus indeed among the *means* which God employs to carry out the plan of the world, the centre in

which all means meet that have for their object the overthrow of sin; a thought, which loses its difficulty just in proportion as we are brought to look into the abyss of evil and at the same time into the depths of Divine love.

It is only the fact of sin in truth, apprehended in its world-vast solemnity and significance, that furnishes an adequate reason for the highest act of God's love. The sense of this fact therefore must lead the way in every effort that is made successfully, to understand or interpret the christological mystery.

The distinguished writer, whom we have been trying to follow in this article in the way of free synopsis, is careful to tell us that he has no idea of charging the perilous consequences, which he is led to point out as apparently flowing from the theory he reviews, on such excellent men as Liebner and others who have stood forward in its defence. He regards them rather as fellow laborers with himself on the same platform of evangelical freedom, and has no doubt but that they have in their own way of looking at the subject what are supposed to be sufficient precautions against these consequences. His object is accordingly to open the way for their bringing out still more fully and distinctly the entire sense of their system, in all its aspects and bearings. "This inquiry proposes to be nothing more," he says, "than an excitement to a new revision of the christological theory in question, on the basis of the true biblical theism, and to a solution if possible of the difficulties now presented; for which very reason it has been felt necessary to give them the most sharp and distinct expression. If they can be shown to be groundless, of course on the basis just mentioned, the writer would not wish to be among the last certainly to embrace a view, the special advantages of which for the scientific construction of christian doctrine he can fully appreciate."

J. W. N.

### THE SCOTCH IRISH ELEMENT IN AMERICAN SOCIETY.

THE return of the Eagle Wing to Ireland and debarkation of her disconcerted company at Lockfergus, Nov. 3rd, 1636, formed an incident in the world's chronicles, that in its results has exerted an influence upon the destinies of the United States next to that of the memorable event which has consecrated the Rock of Plymouth among New England reminiscences. The whole adventure was mortifying in the highest degree, and beyond surmise afforded rare sport to the laughers of the time. But those brave pilgrims might have consoled themselves, if they did not, with the reflection that an ordeal of great humiliation and reproach has in manifold instances proved, like the tomb of Christ, a watch-house of angels from which the exodus of a regenerated refined humanity has insured, in the end, a nobler life and destiny to different sections of the human family. The bird of flame rising from its ashes with stronger and more beautiful wings, parables a majestic truth. Had Hamilton, Livingston, Blair, and McClelland, gained with their associates the New England coast, and settled, as was proposed, upon the banks of the Merrimac, they would undoubtedly have lost in a short time their distinctive peculiarities under the plastic hand of Puritanism. We fancy then, the tempestuous north-wester which swept so fiercely around the ship's mast head, and drove back the dispirited adventurers to Lockfergus, was nothing less than one of God's strong angels. It was not for these predestinated patriarchs of the Scotch Irish family to resist the judgment of fate;—it was not for them to contravene the designs of Providence in reference to the true mission of their race. The horoscope of that race was already cast.

Through the latter half of the seventeenth century, the Court of Louis the Fourteenth was to civilized Europe the cynosure of the political world. Statesmen on all sides were accustomed to scan with anxious eyes the bearings in council and camp of Mazarine and Turenne, the first stars of that constellation, and therefrom vaticinate the fortunes of mankind. During the same active period the province of Ulster, remote from the polished centres of European civilization, comprised within its borders an obscure Scottish colony, whose very existence was unrecorded by the great authors of the time. No modern Elijah then stood upon the top of Carmel, and discerned the little cloud arising from the sea like a man's hand. There nevertheless, unregard-

ded and unknown, the Covenanter rocked the cradle of liberty amid provincial turbulence, and prepared an element of power which, the next century, entered largely into the structure of the American model of constitutional freedom :—a model which the French people, forgetting the religion and loyalty of ages, transformed into a divinity, whose carnival they celebrated upon the ruins of the Bourbon dynasty.

Let us not be understood, for a moment, as designing to present here a surprising instance of the frustration of human prescience,—a magnificent case of “turning of the tables” in which the scene is shifted through the civilized world, and the time of exhibition extends through centuries. We do not think of this ; for such ups and downs form no anomalies in human history. We wish first to engage transient attention to the inference that a pure faith and sound principles not only tend to elevate the moral life of a people, as every body knows, but, in the long race, are better adapted than profound diplomacy and gigantic power to insure the equivalents of terrene prosperity and renown. We desire however chiefly, through the passing sunshine cast by the Scotch Irish episode upon the surface of the historic stream, to draw attention to the deep divine flow beneath.

History, as regarded in its familiar civil import, comes before us like Banvard's Panorama of the Mississippi, displaying by successive pictorial illustrations the majestic stream of human events, and giving perhaps, at each view, a useful lesson to the living world audience. No one however who discerns merely the human pencilling here can trace the moral of the exhibition in its largest sense. In a higher view the human must be counted as symbolic. History then must be deciphered like the Rosetta stone. It is God's symbolic registry ; and the thoughts and deeds of men wrought into it are but hieroglyphs which convey to the thoughtful the strong and consistent development of the divine purposes. In truth, with Christ for our Champollion, we may find the true philosophy of all history here, as it serves to unfold the great mind of God in his providence.

We have felt some chagrin, we honestly confess, at the neglect which the Scotch Irish have experienced from historians of American colonization. In vain, for example, do we look for the “exile of Erin” through Bancroft's picture gallery of the colonists. There is the Puritan limned again and again, with filial reverence and partiality, at the different stages of his career. Aye, there look out upon us his progressive portraits, reminding us forcibly of the old prints, that used to solemnize our juvenile thoughts, in which the successive decennial periods of human



life, by a striking prosopopeia are made to follow each other over the arc of a semicircle. There is the Virginia Planter in full costume,—and the story of his renown, drawn with “the point of a diamond,” detailing the whole budget of romantic incident which distinguished his career *on this side the water*. All very well, as he had little to boast of among the colonial confessors in the way of trans-atlantic sufferings for either civil or religious rights. There too are the marked features of the Quaker: We see him as, with unearthly look, he emerged in England from his celestial school-house: We see him again in the midst of his early persecutions, looking like a great glad boy who shouts merrily in the howling whirlwind that is forcing and following him along. And we hail him again in the quiet vernal morning of Pennsylvania—as glorious as the morning, bargaining with the Red men under primeval trees. The Huguenot, the Hollander, and the Scottish colonist of East Jersey, all receive a fugitive sketch: but the Scotch-Irishman, with his honest friend the German, has been suffered to pass through into the background, without the grace of a formal introduction. Whence this neglect? Is it forsooth because these comrades came late upon the ground? Our historian should not have forgotten the catholic scope of the lesson, taught in the divine apologue of the laborers who were sent at different hours of the day into the vineyard. There is a homebred prejudice potent in its influence existing in every community, enlisted as by some magnetic charm in behalf of what are termed “old families.” These families, sprung from fortunate land speculators of an early day, are seldom found in the front of those improvements which give dignity to the age; nay, as a body, they more frequently incline to obstruct the course of progress and reform. Yet their time-honored domains and lombardy poplars, acting like a prism, invest them with a fictitious glory, under which they claim and receive general homage. Upon the same principle, we suppose, the descendants of the earlier colonists, of those particularly over whose nativity the venerable elms of England waved their ennobling shadows, have exacted for their ancestral lineage down to themselves the chief place of honor among the elementary constituents of American Society. But, in all seriousness, we believe that our great historians have not done justice to the Scotch-Irish. A race which has dignified the military annals of the country by contributing thereto the great names of Montgomery, Stark, Wayne, Sullivan, and Jackson; which has furnished to the counsels of the nation a like proportion of eminent civilians, from Madison down to Calhoun; which has given

three incumbents to the Presidential chair:—a race which has undoubtedly established the leading features of society throughout Pennsylvania, in large sections of Maryland, through the middle and western portions of Virginia, and over the greater part of North Carolina; and which embracing as it ever did an enterprising yeomanry, early pushed its fortunes westward, and staked out the landmarks of Tennessee and Kentucky; and first peopled the southern moiety of that portion of the North-west territory, comprising the present States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois:—such a race, had it brought, like the German,<sup>1</sup> nothing more than sturdy material forces into the country, would have been entitled to the respectful consideration of impartial history.<sup>2</sup> But when we consider the effective political philosophy it cast into the scale, as attested by a careful view of external evidences, and confirmed by the Westminster type so strikingly mirrored in the fabric of our liberties, we confidently aver that no delineation can present a full true history of American freedom, as to its organic conditions, which fails to depict the origin, principles, and discipline, of the Ulster Presbyterians. The political tenets of the emigrant from Ulster, like a shadow, ever took the outlines of his ecclesiastical creed; and in the representative scheme of his presbytery was involved the republican principle, which found room for its embodiment here in kindred forms of civil government.

Energetic conservatism is the most prominent trait discernible

---

<sup>1</sup> We are far from intending any disparagement. But the German mind, with all its sterling worth, through difference of language, has been, until recently, a sealed casket.

<sup>2</sup> "The most numerous settlers in the north western part of Carolina are Protestants chiefly Presbyterians from the north of Ireland." Again, "a considerable part of N. Carolina is inhabited by those people or their descendants." Again, "They migrated in thousands to Pennsylvania, a province in which the principles of civil and religious liberty had their full operation."—*History of N. Carolina*, by H. Williamson, L. L. D.

"The place is a new settlement, generally settled with people from Ireland, as all our congregations in Pennsylvania, except two or three, chiefly are made up of people from that kingdom."—*Letter of Samuel Blair*, 1740.

"Then (1737) commenced a tide of emigration from the province of Ulster, Ireland, that spread over a beautiful section of Virginia, and filled up her wild borders with a peculiar race. The influence of that race of men on Virginia, in making her what she is, &c." Again, "After the choice locations in Pennsylvania and Maryland were filled up they crossed the Potomac, &c." Again, "When the most inviting regions in this southern direction were occupied the succeeding immigrants (from Ulster,) crossed the Alleghanies, and soon filled West Pennsylvania, Kentucky and Tennessee."—*Sketches of Virginia* by W. H. Foote, D. D.

in the character of the Scotch-Irish. They regard with constitutional dislike the radical leanings of freethinking Puritanism. Law and order, as they exist in the government of their choice, are to them a genuine rescript from heaven ; and their civil obligations they revere as they do the precepts of their Bibles. It is impiety with them to be disloyal to the government, which throws a just protection over their rights. With this attribute of character in the ascendant, they were highly qualified for the geographical position assigned them by Providence in the United States. Thus whilst the dignity of civilization, wealth and power, brightened the vast Indian regions through which their migration rolled westward, the States they formed, north and south, were at the same time welded together by strong fraternal sympathies. The ligaments which connect the descendants of the Scotch Irish family on both sides of the slavery line, constitute to this day the strongest bond of the American Union. It was their destiny, in furtherance of their mission, to usurp the birthright of the Quaker. The benison intended for Esau fell upon Jacob.

The true genius of Quakerism is contemplative, not active. As with Adam in Paradise, its initial life was crowned at once with all the sturdy qualities of manhood. Fox, Penn, and Barclay, formed its glowing meridian, which has been preceded by no morning. It stalked forth suddenly in Europe divinely equipped for its world mission, like the mythological Pallas, or, as it aspired to be, like the apostles after the descent of cloven tongues : and then only, when under the thrilling supposition of its celestial ordination it tossed to and fro in delirious ecstasy, was the power of its arm felt in the world. This Pentecost proved a poor type of its subsequent historic life. The phrenzy of the seer subsided at length into the philosophy of the sage. Quakerism withdrew to its own quiet fireside to contemplate alone the "inner light," and left the world out-doors to mind itself. The genius of Quakerism is stationary if not retrogressive, and like the fabled Narcissus has taken root in adoring its own image. When the bursting hosannas with which it glorified its own advent had subsided, its temper assumed the mould, which, but little impaired by the decadence of two centuries, it has retained until the present time. By reason of its reserved antiquated social attitude, its voice has never been influential in the States. Its periodical protests against slavery and war, like the striking of a clock in the room where we sit, are seldom heard at all. Blessings on the Pennsylvania Quaker nevertheless, for the home he freely tendered the fugitive for conscience

sake!—for the agricultural domains, and “freedom to worship God,” in its copious sense, he gave the stranger!—a boon the Puritan of Massachusetts or Connecticut could not find it in his heart to bestow, nor the Virginia Cavalier! Blessings on the Quaker! But there ended his precedence; for with his refined feminine scruples on the subjects of physical resistance and military duty, his ascetic notions of social propriety, and the neutral and negative predominant in his psychological life, he was incapable of directing to a beneficial issue the wild progress of the Anglo-Saxon in the western world. The frame work of his system has no congruity to the architectural orders of living society. It is a century behind, or may be, in some of its characteristics a century in advance of the times!

The Scotch Irish wrenched the sceptre from the Quaker's hand. They came with their coats off ready to enter upon the world work for which they had served, in their own green island, a centennial apprenticeship. Combining the conditions of energy, piety and conservatism, they were just suited to the exigencies of the people, whose social and civil progress they were destined to control. The population among which they have had their mission is chiefly of English and German origin. Some other races are represented here and there like sprinkling rain-drops.

Here we are in doubt how to proceed. Shall we attempt to sketch the German, the Cavalier, the Huguenot or the Swede, and exhibit the improvement, if any, wrought in his nature from Scotch Irish interminglings and infusions? Or shall we closely follow, like the sunflower, our luminary? Shall we contemplate in the Scotch Irishman those qualities which, like solar beams, have vivified the circle of his social horizon? We are perplexed,—like a stranger in New-York at the Five Points. We survey the subjects before us, as did the modest knight of *Ivanhoe* the fair ladies who graced the Lists of Ashby. But in humble imitation we will do as did that paragon of knighthood,—who brightened the visions of our boyhood,—we will plant ourselves, lance in hand, before our kith and kin; and, were it only ours, we would deposit the “coronet of green with its circlet of gold” at the feet of our own true Saxon, maugre the phlegm of the German, or the curling lip of the Planter! This question settled we advance, with a heart glowing from the effects of the spontaneous flash of chivalry we have displayed.

Calvinism and the Presbyterian polity have operated powerfully on the Scotch Irish nature, and developed therein two pre-eminent characteristics: first, from the Scotch side of the house,

*stability, next a beneficial moral and educational tendency.* The stability of this race has been fully tested by the uniform drift of their character since known as a distinct people. Their religious scheme, their politics, their domestic and sacred customs, form a harmonious economy, admitting at no time important changes or modifications. They reverence the symbols and forms their forefathers established, and which an emerald antiquity has at length sanctified, with all the passion that men in a new country generally have for novelty and change. This feature, true to the letter in all the rural districts, is but slightly compromised even at the great centres of trade. The stable character of their institutions is maintained against foreign influences, by means of the greatest precaution and providence. The vigilance, for instance, with which in their churches they guard the approach to the Lord's table, calls to mind the sternness employed at the gate of Eden "to keep the way of the tree of life." Their practice does not sanction the establishment of nurseries for novices from the world. They have no naturalization system, no spiritual vestibules for catechumens. They repudiate the entire doctrine of middle states, from purgatory downwards. They remember the moral taught in Esop's fable of the countryman warming the torpid viper. The neophyte must prove himself correct upon vexed theological questions outside the house: he must be established in doctrine and grace before he can be admitted within. He then when he enters takes his predestined place, and gives at once strong aid toward the consolidation of the spiritual temple: he is like the stones employed in the building of that other temple upon which the sound of hammers and axes was not heard.

The conservation of the Scotch Irish character contrasts broadly with the opposite temper of New England Puritanism. The prominent characteristics of the latter, intellectual irresponsibility and ecclesiastical independence, have wrought deeply upon its history,—beside much that is good—the dark symbols of doctrinal libertinism both in respect to church and state. Puritanism is ever in a transition state. Would you take its proportions, you must employ stenographic notes, for the form you see is but the chrysalis of a new life, almost ready to come upon the stage and bow to the public. Aye, with a sort of moral vandalism, it has entered the most holy place, and subjected to mutilation the "ark of the testimony" of the Pilgrim fathers. Sacrilegious speculation has broken this venerable heirloom into fragments.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We read some time ago in a Boston paper, that Dr. Woods of Andover

The next characteristic mentioned as resulting, in some sort, from the Westminster baptism of the Scotch Irish was a sound moral and educational tendency. The religious system which, aside from higher objects, promotes the happiness of the people and renders the country prosperous where its influence is dominant, must undoubtedly, so far as human considerations prevail, be wisely conceived, in any scheme of church polity. History and observation both confirm the statement, that where Calvinistic theology has prevailed, especially under presbyterial forms as in Scotland, not only has the administration of the state been marked by energy and success, but the condition of society in its subordinate details has ever been distinguished by simplicity and probity. Western Pennsylvania, in every community of which the Scotch Irish race forms the ruling element, affords an instance to our hand with which we are most familiar. Often in our short excursions through Alleghany, Washington, and Fayette counties, we have paused to behold the panorama of domestic life embraced in some picturesque settlement, and to consider the evidences of prosperity and careless security abounding on every side. The rights of property were respected by sound universal practice. Here for example we saw the implements of husbandry, at sunset, lying in the distant grain-field, far from the guardianship of the household: as a common thing, they lay scattered day and night carelessly around the homestead. Again we would observe the valuable effects of some wayfarer deposited for the night upon the open porch; this same apartment being perhaps the permanent receptacle of a full tithe of the family wealth,—its angles and sides being lined with the perpetual bag of corn-meal, a sett or two of harness, and a motley collection of mechanical tools. Upon closer inquisition we might have found the house-bolt, procured during the primeval troubles,—the time of Indian inroads or of the Whiskey insurrection—all rusted in its keep. But for protection against merry mad urchins upon Hallowmass eve its use had grown wholly obsolete, for in these agricultural districts the crime of burglary was unknown. We saw the accomplishment of prophecy around us: "They shall dwell safely and none shall make them afraid." Perhaps, for we profess to have some candor, the kaleidoscope of a kindred lineage threw, to our eyes, a more touching light

---

was delivering a series of lectures, showing what the theology of the Puritans is. We should like to see Theodore Parker's version of the old Puritan type placed beside the Andover Doctor's.

over monuments which so forcibly illustrated the integrity of society.

The high-wrought religious organization of the Scotch Irishman led him to commit the wealth of his mind and heart to the keeping of his faith. He habitually looked upon the world through the telescope of the Gospel,—that telescope whose lenses had been adjusted for him by Calvin and John Knox. Thus he saw that a sound system of education was needed to mellow the common mind, for the reception of the seminal principles of civil and religious liberty; and accordingly true to the part assigned him in the great western drama, he erected in every settlement the school-house as the next condition of society to the church. He planted academies; and established his famous log colleges in Pennsylvania, that were—to mention human means—the mainsprings of religious awakenings which made “the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord.” In these, and in similar institutions of an improved character, which he subsequently founded in Virginia, he always conceded to the clergy the highest chairs of instruction, in order that the spirit of the learned professions and influential circles, whose strength was recruited from these scholastic retreats, might be tempered by the graces of piety. We close our argument on this part by repeating, with side glances at Geneva and the Scotch Kirk, the aphorism which dropped from the lips of the Saviour: “The tree is known by his fruit.”

Another striking trait in the Scotch Irishman's character is sensibility. His ardent sympathetic nature, derived from the Irish side of the family, elevates him in some respects as a public teacher above his great intellectual rival the Puritan. His eloquence is characteristically impassioned. In the Senate and even at the Bar—not to mention stump-oratory—his thoughts generally are strongly marked by the colorings of the heart: and his earnest solemn monitions from the Pulpit, like morning sunbeams among dew-drops, charm and impress the more for their shimmering upon us through tears. The soul-entrancing epilogues of Grattan, Kirwan<sup>1</sup> and Emmett, were but the lofty utterance of the great national heart. The glory of the orator here was the glory of interpreting most effectively the higher Irish feeling; and any claim to this feeling as a mere personal endowment would have resembled the daring impiety of Moses and Aaron at Meribah.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not of course Dr. Murray.



Passion is essential to the existence of true symmetrical humanity. Remove it, and with the separation, the productions of genius lose their tropical fragrance. It is the best interpreter of human destiny; for the great future, which appalls the vision of the pure mind, by unfolding thereto a stern shadowy realm governed by unalterable institutes, becomes under the vernal breathings of sensibility a rich and holy world. There is profound religious truth in heart teachings. The heart will leap, like the Baptist in the womb, through strong sympathy when the *Divine* and *Eternal* draw near, although the mind, tethered within its charmed philosophical circle, may not comprehend in full the nature or fact of the august presence. It is foolishness to the Greeks. The Scotch Irish preacher, whilst he thoroughly prepares his subject for the pulpit, discards when there the aid of written notes. His emotion, when contemplating before him in the church Adam's fallen race, are not such as might be called up in his study, and chained down under the symbols of his manuscript. Around him he looks upon dear kindred souls ready to perish: solemn breezes from the eternal world come wafting by him; and the rushing of angelic wings is heard, like the dread portents of general doom! He stands like Aaron between the living and the dead, that the plague may be stayed! Passion of soul produced by such influences cannot be seized by any art, and fettered in alphabetic characters, to be recited in measured cadences. Whitefield, whose spiritual life, with all its organic peculiarities, had been strengthened under a different system of gymnastics, found, among a large portion of the Scotch Irish ministry in Pennsylvania and Virginia, enthusiasm cognate to his own. "Night was as it were turned into day when we rode singing through the woods," exclaimed this apostolic evangelist in reference to his intercourse with the Tennents, Finely, and Blair. This sanguine temperament has proved an effectual auxiliary in promoting those wonderful revivals, which have, from time to time, enlarged the borders of the Scotch Irish church, both in Ulster and through the United States.

The capital, so to speak, brought by our Scottish bridegroom to Ulster on the day of his espousals was, as has been seen, a vigorous religious system. We have already judged that system by its fruits, viz: its fine conservative and social effects upon the household. We have also mentioned the bride's marriage dowry, namely the Golconda of a rich glowing heart;—revealing whence the life and coloring have come, which are always found to animate the faithful canvas of the bluestocking family. We come now to speak more particularly of the political education

of the house, and of the spirit of liberty fostered under these parental influences, which was habitually displayed by the race. It is with some degree of pride we approach this topic, for its consideration makes known the great and peculiar honor which belongs to the Protestant Irishman. A carefully formed estimate of religious liberty constituted a base, upon which his opinions of political rights rested, and with which they ever stood combined, forming a consistent piece "like apples of gold in pictures of silver." The democratic idea, that the authority of the magistrate emanates from the people, was incorporated at an early day in the Scotch Irish creed. "Men are called to the magistracy by the suffrage of the people whom they govern,"—solemnly responded one of their ministers in the name of his brethren to an English Parliamentary committee in 1650. This fundamental principle in republican politics was but the faithful image of the great church doctrine which embroiled them in perpetual conflicts with English prelacy, and led them finally to choose a home in the American forests, viz: the popular right in respect to electing pastors, and determining the forms of worship. It was the amplification of these twin doctrines, aided by an old grudge against a government, which, notwithstanding their prowess at Londonderry and the Boyne, had never done them justice, that furnished them with sufficient reasons for assuming in their adopted country the initiative in the American Revolution;—by resisting on the banks of the Alamance the militia of Gov. Tryon, in 1771, and promulgating from Mecklenburg Court-house, North Carolina, in May 1775, the first bold manifest looking firmly at the scheme of colonial independence. The same doctrines, endeared yet more and consecrated through conflict and trial, drew from the mountains and vallies of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina, to meet the demands of the Revolutionary contest, a hardy intelligent yeomanry, whose inflexible devotion to popular liberty has justly won for the Presbyterian Bluestocking the highest grade of canonization in the temple of freedom. But we design not here to paint the physical prowess of the Scotch Irish. Their true mission was more sublime. It was their glory to be the great champions in America of the rights of the soul. In Virginia they confronted alone for generations an intolerant hierarchy, in behalf of conscience and the dissenting portion of the colony.<sup>1</sup> We confess

---

<sup>1</sup> The revised Act for Conformity 1642 ran thus: "For the preservation of purity of doctrine and unity of the church, It is enacted that all minis-

now to a sentiment, which in no other connexion, we firmly maintain, has at any time mingled with the vanities of our brightest castle-building. It is an aspiration after the honor of writing a book,—a history of the development of spiritual freedom in the country. We would therein show how this cause, through gloomy ages, heard its truest utterances from the lips of the Scotch Irish clergy. Emotions sad, wild, and joyous, pour like a flood through the heart, whenever we consider the determined self-denying crusade of these knight-templars. Their pathway in life, in its worldly look, led through briers and thorns. Many of them went to rest leaving the great work unfinished: yet patient, Christ-like in their charity, they fell one by one, faithful witnesses of the truth, brightening with rich smiles death's approaches, at the hopeful thought that their children or their children's children would, in their day, string the lyre of freedom to full harmony, and pour its triumphant notes through the vallies and hills of the dear "Old Dominion." Francis McKemie, the Scotch Irish apostle of the colonies, entered the country in 1683 or '84, and labored principally in Maryland and Virginia. There were some scenes in the life of this great man which would have embellished the best pages written by the ancients upon moral sublimity. Paul before Agrippa, or Luther at Worms, furnished not to Italian or Flemish artists a purer or more elevated study in moral æsthetics than is presented in McKemie's trial at New-York, 1707, for preaching without Lord Cornbury's license the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Jerusalem and the old Germanic Absolutism in the back-ground of the great Apostle and great Reformer lessen by their historic consonance the sense of mighty wrong, and thus fail to produce in full that thrilling effect which the lofty relieve of the American scene drawn against the free green forests of the occident must ever awaken. Davies, engrafted upon the Scotch Irish stock, and reflecting by his illustrious generalship, like Marshal McDonald who led the brilliant charge of Wagram, transcendent glory upon the race of his adoption. Waddel, whose immortal portrait has given its chief popular renown to the pencil of Wirt, Graham and the two Smiths, loom upon the holy battle

---

ters whatsoever which shall shall reside in the colony are to be conformable to the orders and constitutions of the church of England, and the laws therein established, and not otherwise to be admitted to teach or preach publicly or privately, And that the Governor and Council do take care that all non-conformists upon notice of them shall be compelled to depart the colony with all convenience."

plain in almost superhuman proportions. We have examined with some care a half-dozen memorials in behalf of religious liberty, which were presented by the Hanover Presbytery to the General Assembly of Virginia, during and after the period of the Revolution, until 1785, about the close of which year the famous bill of religious rights was passed. These documents, in our humble judgement, compare favorably in style and contents with the cleverest State papers of that most brilliant period in the annals of Virginia. They are distinguished by comprehensive thought, clear appreciation, great political sagacity, and dignified monitive earnestness. This clerical body mainly represented the yeomanry, whose backing gave strength and confidence to Henry, Jefferson, and Madison, through the various phases the religious question assumed before its final settlement. That yeomanry consisted principally, it is known, of the Scotch Irish and German races. The German, whose sympathies and conscience were strongly enlisted in this cause, was shorn of his proper strength and prominence in the conflict by reason of his foreign language. The moral force, therefore, which his known feelings and his numbers gave to the right side, was skillfully employed in the struggle by his more fortunate comrade.

We cannot, before we close this part of our subject, restrain a passing comment on the singular association by which these two races have been marked in their entire American migration. Upon mountain slope or plain, in forest or prairie, on river or lake they are always found side by side. It is not our privilege to compare their mutual attachment to the hallowed delicate relationship of David and Jonathan, whose souls were knit together like the bodies of the Siamese Twins; nor to the exalted classic friendship of Damon and Pythias, which sets off like a diamond the live-long eloquence of the rural Academy. Alas, poetry and the transcendental philosophy, which, somewhat after the manner of Jacob's pilled rods, promote the conception of this noble ringstreaked offspring of the affections, are the exclusive property of the higher Germanic life! The harp of Schiller, which ranged as gloriously as ever did that of Apollo through its lordly diapasons, poured its majestic symphonies only upon the cultivated heart of the fatherland; and the refined lineaments of that heart alone brightened and glowed with dream-like beauty under the divine cognitions of Kant. The drama-colored sacrificing of self upon the altar of romantic sentiment is therefore a part of the tragedy, which, as far as the German is concerned, the fatherland mystics must enact. It implies a condition of soul which is not distributed, like the love of God,

without "respect of persons." Our American German generally presents a less exalted type of feeling. He has never enjoyed the *intuition* of the modern Eleusinian Mysteries: The mystic word, the *Feldgeschrei*, required by the hierophants is still Greek to him. But withal, his common-sense, methodical, child-like temper, with its every whim, yet with its golden fortune of truthfulness, suits our taste to a tie. His companionship with the Scotch Irish is marked, on both sides, by strong practical sympathy. We may, by reversing the rules of rhetoric and comparing great things to small, trace a very distant similitude between this unsophisticated attachment and the bond which holds between the crusty fretted urchin and his impatient elder brother, who are wending their way, hand in hand, by maternal direction, to the district school. The lads may torment each other,—they may scold like parrots, but, with all that, doubt not their mutual affection: for should danger assail one, the other true as steel will side with him against the whole world of boyhood.

We now ask the grace of our readers whilst we trip lightly through some adjuncts of our subject which we have no wish to survey at large, and then we'll make our exit. The religious element, as we have seen, is the loadstone of the Scotch Irish mind. In all their primitive settlements the "Meeting-house" was the orb, around which social and civil as well as spiritual interests constantly revolved, and whose monitory radii swept without a shadow the purlieus of the entire community. The pulpit was the oracle, whose infallible utterances decided all the grave questions of the day, and, by condescending to define the common proprieties of conduct, gave dignity to social and domestic scruples. Parents, in accordance with the bluestocking notions entertained in regard to the sanctification of the Sabbath, brought methodically all the members of the household, down to the newly baptized babe, to the church. Accordingly, during the time of religious service, it was sometimes impossible, in consequence of the crying of infants, for a stranger, who might be present, to follow the logic of the sacred desk. Not so with the descendant of the Covenanter! There he sat,—like a vision looming up from the far off realm of our boyhood,—with his coat off in the sultry summer day, and his still blue eye upturned upon the glowing face of the good old preacher, and the sabbatic side of his mind profoundly intent on the concrete disquisition of the day! There he sat; and, as they tell us that the plaintive guitar used to aid with its familiar accompaniment the ancient troubadour in composing and reciting his extempore bal-

lads, so here the wail of infancy, with the occasional snarling and conflict of petty curs, far from distracting our auditor, seemed in truth to nerve his mind and endue it with additional reach and power for digesting the pending theme. The conditions of distance and weather, so generally paramount considerations, had little to do with the attendance at church of the Scotch Irish. Judge Wilkeson in the *American Pioneer* thus describes this trait of their character in Western Pennsylvania. "It was common for families to ride from ten to fifteen miles to meeting. The young people regularly walked five or six miles, and in summer carried their stockings and shoes, if they had any, in their hands. I believe that no houses of worship were erected in the country until about 1790. Even in winter the meetings were held in the open air. A grove was selected, a log pulpit was erected, and logs furnished the audience with seats. Among the men who attended public worship in winter, ten were obliged to substitute a blanket or coverlet for a great-coat, where one enjoyed the luxury of that article."

The Old School Presbyterian Church, which in all its borders embraces the manly energy of the Scotch Irish element, presents in a religious form the hereditary conservatism of the race. Devoted as this body has ever been to the support of liberty, and anxious as it is for its constitutional extension, as was made abundantly apparent by the conduct of that section of it found in Kentucky, which, with Robert Breckenridge at its head, struggled almost to a man to give the emancipation sentiment the ascendancy in the recent State Convention; yet by its General Assembly, as well as by its lower courts, it has breasted from the first the storm of Abolitionism which for years has menaced the integrity of the Union. The polity of the Federal government, which is constructed so closely upon the model of Presbytery, and whose foundations were cemented with the blood of its holy men, has been ever cherished by this church, like the image of Diana by the Ephesians, as a sacred gift from heaven. In it they hold up to a distracted desponding world an element of promise and power,—the brazen serpent of nations. They would resist to a man then all measures tending to imperil the Federal Compact; holding it justly to be the grandest exterior adumbration of their church scheme, the hearthstone upon which the branches of their scattered family may meet in the Western world, and the grand model of democratic efficiency provided divinely for the direction of the nations.

It seems to us, indeed, as we look back at the proposition with which we set out, that the changeful glowing map of our coun-

try, when historically considered, reflects, to the view of the philanthropist, the beneficent mind of God as manifestly as ever did the "molten looking glass" of the oriental heavens to the wondering gaze of sage or shepherd. And, to be particular, we think that the remarkable adaptation of the Ulster emigration to the parallels which the brightness of its progress has illumined, when considered in its magnificent bearings upon the union, and through it generally upon the world, displays the wisdom and goodness of the Divine will in their most exalted operation. The mission of this race through the land is like the march of Arcturus and Orion through the blue cope of night.

The great satisfaction we feel when surveying the prominence of the Scotch Irish race in the States is ever diminished, when we take a side-look at the pretensions of Puritanism. All the world has heard of "Forefather's day," and how each orator then of the Pilgrim stock, from the lofty stand of Webster down to the lowest rundle of the intellectual ladder, enjoys the God-like prerogative of claiming as a family work *the creation of the United States*. His arrogance meets no rebuke, for on that day he speaks *ex cathedra*, and his person is, as "Typee" would say, *tabooed*. In these vauntful diatribes, constructed upon the great model given by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, the help afforded toward the formation of the Union as it is, by the Middle and Southern States, under the direction of Virginia and the great Washington, is altogether overlooked. And the genius of Patrick Henry, to whose electric flashes we have always felt greatly indebted for enlightening as they did the midnight pathway of the first Congress, was after all it seems as to its benefits worthless as the Jack o'lantern which beguiles the traveller in the glens of his Scottish ancestry. But who would complain? We stand upon the sunny side of our heteroscan neighbors;—we may smile at the adroitness with which they purloin the laurels that have bloomed upon the mountains of the South, wherewith they embellish their festivals. It is a Spartan theft. Aye, let them year by year "take the timbrel and harp and rejoice at the sound of the organ." It is a venial sin, we think, for those who like it, to indulge like Haman in fanfaronade upon the family hearth and among their admiring kindred. But when the descendant of our Scotch Irishman stoops at the door, and begs a seat upon that hearth, then is our sense of dignity wounded. Just as if it were not enough for the vain household to respond one after another to the notable question, "Who killed cock robin?" but our kinsman must volunteer to bear testimony to the deed, after the manner represented in the second stanza



of the nursery rhyme. We can fully appreciate, with such a scene in our view, the sentiment expressed by the greatest of the Caesars when giving up the life struggle, and yielding himself to a sad sublime resignation he exclaimed, "Et tu Brute!"—or the feelings of one greater than Caesar, who is described as showing his wounds, and saying "I was wounded in the house of my friends."

*Sewickley, Pa.*

D. E. N.

---

#### PONTIUS PILATE.

THERE are different methods of acquiring fame or notoriety in this world. Some seek and attain earthly glory and immortality, by the splendor and extensive influence of their achievements, mental, moral or military. Others become notorious, by their association, with persons, and objects of great interest and importance. There was once a Hero who found his way to fame, by firing the temple of Diana, one of the wonders of the world. Another will be held in everlasting remembrance, for having destroyed the Alexandrian Library, far more valuable than all the temples of ancient mythology! To this latter class, belongs Pontius Pilate, the Roman Procurator, "damned to everlasting fame," from his association with his illustrious victim, the greatest and best of all beings, and the incorporation of his name into the Apostles' Creed.

Unquestionably the Biography of the Bible, as well as every other part, was written for our knowledge and edification. Yea, "all scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable" and the design of the whole is to make "the man of God, perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good word and work." The excellencies of character, portrayed in those prayers by the pen of inspiration, are designed for our imitation. And they become more inimitable, by assuming the concrete form of action. On the other hand, failures and sins are designed for our warning and correction, and on the same principle are more impressive and useful, when inwrought into personal life, than when presented as abstractions. With this view, not only are good men, but bad men, introduced to our consideration, in the Bible. We have on one hand the impetuosity and imprudence of Peter, and on another the vacillation and truckling of Pontius Pilate!

We propose in this paper, to consider some of the features of

character, belonging to this notorious Personage, as developed in, or easily deducible from, the scripture narrative.

Our first remark is, that Pontius Pilate may be taken as a representative of the *average* character of thoroughly worldly men, in all ages, whether in church or state. This, probably is not the usual impression; but we can come to no other conclusion, from a careful collection of incidents of the scripture narrative, and the facts derived from the testimony of profane history. We are apt to imagine that there was something almost demoniacal in the wickedness, that could consign such a Being as the incarnate Redeemer, to the ignominious death of the cross, at the instigation of a loathsome existing Hierarchy, and notwithstanding his acknowledged innocence. In our circumstances, and with our knowledge of the true character and mission of the Messiah, this is all very natural. But the illusion vanishes, when we analyse the state of Pilate's mind, and his relations to the Jewish people and their peculiar religious economy. Pilate's point of vision, was intensely and exclusively worldly. His feelings were thoroughly contemptuous towards the whole Jewish nation, high and low alike, sunk as they were then in the lowest depths of degeneracy. The Pharisees were the very personification of formalism and sanctified hypocrisy. The Sadducees, of levity and reckless devotion to pleasure. The mystic and ascetic class of Essenes had probably never crossed the path, or awakened the curiosity, of the Procurator. In this state of things, the controversy between the Hierarchy, and the Lord Jesus Christ, would possess in his estimation nothing but a personal, or at farthest a national interest—a strife for power, where both parties in turn had courted and secured the voice of the populace. To him as Governor of Judea, under Tiberius Caesar, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," though in reality the most glorious of all beings, and engaged in the work for which, the whole theatre of the universe was originally built, was but a state criminal, to be disposed of simply on the principles of an ordinary legal transaction, or according to his own personal determinations. "Knowest thou not" says he to the Saviour, "that I have power to crucify thee or to release thee?" He was one of "the Princes of the world, that came to naught," "and knew not the Lord Jesus." From his brief personal intercourse with the Saviour, he must have been satisfied of his innocence. He must have been struck also, if not awed, by the evidences of superiority, flashing forth amidst that wonderful scene of examination. He must have felt the sublimity of his silence. He knew moreover the low and mean motives, which

actuated his enemies, and that "for envy they had delivered him." But Pontius Pilate, had probably no acquaintance with the Old Testament delineations of the expected Messiah; he had not probably been witness to any of his works or listened to any of his words; the prejudices of his understanding had never been conquered, as was the case with Christ's adversaries by a process, which inflamed more intensely the prejudices of their hearts. Pilate moved in a worldly sphere of thought altogether. He looked at persons and events, Christ and Barabbas, the crucifixion of one or the other, simply as they stood connected with the advancement of worldly interests. He had probably no personal malice towards the Saviour, and would have preferred releasing him, had such a course been for his interests. As it was he evidently tries to shift responsibility, and place it on those by whose suggestions and instigations he was at last compelled to decide!

In all this, Pilate was not, as he is often imagined and indeed represented, an isolated case of unparalleled and unapproachable depravity. He was no monster of iniquity, so exalted above other men in the hellish nature of his acts, that there is no danger or possibility now of repenting his crimes. By such an imagination, we lose all the benefits, designed to be conveyed by the record of his history and the inspired portrait of his character. Thousands, in every successive age, have been quite as bad as Pilate; public men, in every country and every century, have trod in the footsteps of this notorious predecessor and representative of dereliction of principle for popularity, of this looking at Jesus Christ, in the person of his disciples, or the principles of his cause, in the light of present interest. Every where in history, alas! in the range of observation also in our own times and in our own country, in church and state, we find men, whose governing principles, are like Pontius Pilate's—who *placed in his circumstances*, would have acted just as he did, for in analogous circumstances they were actually swayed by the same motives. In ecclesiastical assemblies, underneath the judicial ermine, in the halls of legislation, and in the high places of power, when issues have been presented to worldly men involving a choice between principle and expediency, conscience and convenience, present apparent interest, popularity, pecuniary gain, and high office, on the one hand, or ultimate honor and lasting glory on the other, they have re-enacted, in all essential particulars, the course of the wily Roman Procurator, though from infancy they may have repeated that portion of the common creed of Christendom which says—"He suffered under Pontius Pi-

VOL. III.—NO. III.

late." But for the difference of effects in the one case and the other, such men would stand in the damning reprobation of all good men and all posterity in precisely the same category!

These considerations make the study of this character of value for all time, and no doubt, for this purpose, it has been recorded by the unerring wisdom of inspiration, in close association with the illustrious counterpart! It exhibits our common fallen humanity, an average character of worldliness, manifesting itself in peculiar circumstances indeed, which can never be repeated, but for our warning nevertheless. Pontius Pilate, in the history of our world, stands out eminent like a Pharos, to show public men especially where there are breakers, on which present character, and everlasting hopes, may be wrecked. It is a study eminently appropriate to all, who, from their position in church or state, are tempted to act on expediency, to aim at present popularity, or secure some temporary triumph at the expense of principle, in regard to the great interests of truth and righteousness, the prosperity of their country and the glory of God.

Our second remark is, that the character of Pontius Pilate, as developed in the scripture narrative, manifests the existence and influence of conscience, maintaining a long struggle, yet finally overpowered by the force of lower considerations. We have already stated that Pilate was, probably, ignorant of the character and claims of the Messiah, and viewed Him, as any other person brought before him for trial. Yet evidence of innocence is fully developed by the trial itself, and he solemnly and repeatedly asseverated: "I find no fault in him." His evident reluctance to condemn this obviously innocent person, indicate strongly the actings of conscience. First, he endeavors to transfer the whole case to the spiritual adjudication of the Sanhedrim, disclaiming civil jurisdiction, in a matter which involved the infraction of only ecclesiastical law. "Take him and judge him according to your law." Then, he eagerly avails himself of the plea, that he belonged to the territorial administration of Herod, waiving his prerogatives and making up a long existing feud, rather than assume responsibility. "As soon as he knew, he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod." Finally, by the impressive symbol of washing his hands, he designs to show that, in proceeding to the act of condemnation, he is impelled by the force of circumstances, not of his own convictions. He tries to make a protest to satisfy his conscience, while he surrenders the Son of God to the fury of the populace. Avowing the innocence of his victim, and conscious of the meanness of those who desired his official countenance to their iniquity, he violates

his inward sense of rectitude, under the ignoble fear of consequences and the miserable suggestions of expediency. "So Pilate willing to content the people, released Barabbas and delivered Jesus to be crucified." It is painfully interesting to watch this conflict between the higher and lower principles of man's nature, and to see which triumphs at last. So, in a multitude of similar cases we see a like result. There is a clear apprehension of right and wrong, a frank acknowledgement of an imperative rule of conduct, ordained by infinite authority and commended by infinite motives, an admission of the true glory of acting under all circumstances conformably to this acknowledged standard; yet, at the crisis, low and selfish influences of gain, popularity, present quiet, or acquiescence in surrounding numerical majorities prevail, principle is abandoned, like the Messiah by Pilate, and expediency chosen, like Barabbas by the bigotted Jewish Hierarchy! There are men, whose conscience and judgment are on the side of religion, who know and will admit that it is best and most noble, most certainly connected with present peace and final happiness to be christians, and openly and fully identified with Christ's cause and kingdom, yet because this course of evident right may involve self-denial or interfere with some chosen scheme of earthly aggrandizement, they will continue, for years, possibly to the close of life, in an attitude which conscience condemns, and by which the noble consciousness of rectitude, and all the elements of true greatness, are finally destroyed. There have been men, who have inwardly felt and even publicly avowed for example, their convictions of the wickedness of duelling—that the practice was contrary to the law of God, and their own sense of moral rectitude. Yet these very men, when insulted or challenged, have succumbed to the pressure of a perverted public opinion, and while making a protest, like Pilate, have sanctioned by bloody sacrifices, their own or of others, the misnamed code of honor. They were cowards to avoid the reproach of cowardice, choosing to *seem* rather than *to be* courageous. What an affecting illustration of this conflict is afforded by the case of Alexander Hamilton, one of the brightest names in American history, who for his years had few superiors in any age or country. It is most painful to read the protest he penned, just before he went out to the fatal field, and which was found among his papers after his death. He washed his hands deliberately of the guilt of premeditated murder, by proposing not to fire, and yet yielded himself up a martyr to a Juggernaut whose frowns he could not brave. So in other cases, involving the antagonism of the higher principles of conscience

and accountability to God, and the lower principles of expediency and the fear of man or of present disgrace, we find re-enacted the scene, where Pilate and Barabbas and the Son of God were prominent! Truth and conscience, led away to be crucified, and the robber, guilty of nameless crimes, released.

All such, men in high places especially, cowards in religion and base worshippers of public opinion, should study the recorded portrait of Pontius Pilate, and before they pronounce him a weathercock or monster of wickedness, see whether they are not in their sphere, as weak and wicked as he was.

Once more, a special characteristic of Pontius Pilate, developed, in the scripture narrative, is that he violated conscience and condemned the innocent, for fear of losing office with its connected honors and emoluments. Decisive influence, in the long conflict between conscience and expediency in his bosom, was exerted by the ingenious suggestion: "If thou let this man go, thou art no friend of Caesar—Who ever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar." There was magic, to the sensibilities of Pilate, in the mention of that name, embodying the might and majesty of Roman power in the person of its Emperor. Caesar was the centre of patronage, the sun around which the satellites of the mighty system of the Roman Empire, to its widest circumference, then revolved, and separated from which they were lost. To Pilate, who identified, as worldlings usually do, glory with civil advancement and the frown of the court with political death, this suggestion presented an overwhelming difficulty. Could right be done and office retained, the innocent spared and the good esteem of the sovereign and patronage of the influential at the same time secured, his course would have been plain. But, he must choose between these two irreconcilable courses; either venture on danger and political death, in the discharge of duty, or retain office, honor and emolument, by doing wrong. In this dilemma, he falters, trifles with the first dictates of the inward monitor, usually most distinct and accurate, and finally yields to the popular clamor and the pressure of political ambition, as multitudes in every age have done, when placed in a similar predicament.

Oh! how often since the age of Pontius Pilate, and notwithstanding the plain lesson of his history, have analogous influences produced similar results, with the time serving votaries of popularity, the ambitious aspirants of office, or the cowardly worshippers of numerical majorities!!

The price or prospect, by which the power of conscience is torpified or suspended, varies in different individuals and periods.

Sometimes it is high office in the state, and again the high places of ecclesiastical power. To one man, it is a commanding position in a political party, to another, "to be called of men Rabbi, and to have the chief seat in the synagogue." Some are swerved into tangent or tortuous courses, by the presence and interposition of only a large attracting body, their conscience being large and massive. Others, whose moral gravity is inconsiderable, may be deflected from the right orbit by means amazingly small. As the Deceiver once said to the Saviour, after shewing him "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," the mightiest attraction ever presented to the ambition of the heart, "All this will I give thee," so suiting the power to the resistance to be overcome, he says to the vacillating conscience and the excited aspiration, "All this, will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me," and relinquish right, God's approbation and thine own! On the other hand, says the wily tempter: "If you do this, though it is right, and you will meet the cravings of what men called conscience, you will always be poor"—"You can never secure or exert any large influence"—"As the world goes, success is the criterion of excellence and you are doomed, if you allow your chivalrous sense of honor or the fictions of the moral sense to sway you, to be identified with the crushed party; and then, farewell to the glory and emolument of high and honorable elevation." There have been men, who under these influences have deliberately changed sides in politics or religion, and adjusted themselves without special inconvenience to their new position, though it involved a practical oblivion of all their previous thinking, speaking, and acting. I heard once of a Physician, who subscribed a new creed of politics in a single night, from the promise of the special patronage of the party, and who became "rich and increased in goods" from that crisis, and of another, who refused the same offer, from the same source, and who maintained afterwards a long and manly fight with poverty, upheld and cheered by a good conscience. No doubt, the clerical profession, if we were fond of rioting in the garbage of fallen humanity would furnish similar sickening illustrations. Many a Pontius Pilate, since the crucifixion of Christ, has delivered up the noblest attribute of humanity, under such suggestions, to be crucified; and as a righteous consequence, in God's retributive arrangements, has been doomed to lose, both the happiness of an approving conscience, and the very honors and emoluments for the sake of which he consented to become morally humiliated! Oh! it is a glorious thing, though rare, to see a man, of "like passions with



others," willing and purposed to do right, regardless of present consequences, nobly heedless of popular clamor, or court favor, contented in the consciousness of consistent rectitude, as the crushed hero on the field of Pavia, to lose every thing but honor; preferring the smile of God to the smile or sunshine of Caesar. In the great crisis of a country, a church or a race, these are the men "whose price is above rubies." Their position, in proportion to its perils and temptations, Posterity will approve, if a contemporary and perverted generation should condemn. Such a man was Andrew Marvel, in the corrupt age of Charles II; and such a hero was Marion, in the midnight of the Revolution! Such principled heroes, however, counter parts of Pontius Pilate in every point, are not formed on worldly maxims of carnal policy. The recognition of a higher power—an omniscient God—assimilation to a nobler model, even the mind of Christ, the sweet consciousness of a better inheritance and an amaranthine crown, and a steadfast appeal to an impartial final tribunal, are the elements, which enter into the composition of such a character. Against a man, entrenched in such fortresses the weapons of carnal expediency, wielded ever by Satanic cunning have no power.

"Non civium ardor prava jubentium,  
Non vultus instantis tyranni,  
Mente quatit solidâ."

The all-sufficing reply to all suggestions of temporizing, or tortuous policy, all appeals addressed to ambition and vain glory, is compressed in words of this kind: "How can I do this thing, and sin against God?"—"Thou God seest me!"—"Get thee behind me Satan." These are the shields of imperilled virtue, the talismans of its triumph. "As ever in the great Taskmaster's eye," such a man will do right, even at the loss of all things, nor do conscious wrong, were the whole world, and the kingdoms and the glory of it, conveyed to him, in fee simple, from its present usurped Proprietor!

Well were it for our country and our race, if the men to whom its guidance is committed, and by whose agency its destiny is influenced, were always men of this high moral stamp, and if no successors of Pontius Pilate were found in the Legislative, Judicial and Executive departments of influence in our world! Well—it is vain, simply to wish; it is not enough merely to say, that such may be the case. Every man, especially every christian man, is responsible to the extent of his influence, in all his relations, for shaping such a state of political morals, as will

make it the *interest* of all men, everywhere, to do right, even if higher motives are inoperative. Every christian, is at least obligated, when occasion is afforded on a lower or higher scale, to exhibit a personal exemplification of a character, in every aspect the moral antithesis of Pontius Pilate's! Christianity is designed, not only to qualify men for citizenship in glory after leaving "this present evil world," but to make them "the Light of the world and the Salt of the Earth," in their present interimistic relations. Other countries have failed in their struggles for inalienable rights, because, amidst the wild tempests of revolutionary fury, there was not enough of principled christianity infused and living, to counteract the violence of depraved passions or the meanness of personal aggrandizement. If ever our country perishes, which may Heaven in mercy forbid, not indeed as a succession of individuals, but for all the high purposes of a nation, it will be because the representatives of Pontius Pilate, men who prefer Barabbas to Jesus Christ, if such a course will subserve their sinister purposes, are placed in power, in the misguided exercise of our elective franchises!

Finally, the subsequent history and terrible catastrophe of Pilate's life, is fraught with warning and instruction. Authentic history informs us, that shortly afterwards he was superseded in office, accused before the Emperor, and banished to a distant part of the Empire, where he perished at length by his own hand! Such was "the end of Earth" to Pontius Pilate, who condemned "the Just one." A wild Irish legend tells us, that *Ireland*, was the place of his banishment, and one of its dreariest mountain deserts the theatre of his miserable and unsolaced suicide! The legend, goes on to say, that he is doomed to wander over the earth, a disturbed spirit to this hour. Enough is known to prove, that in his case "vaulting ambition, o'er leapt itself, and fell on t'other side." That, for which he surrendered truth and conscience, he after all failed to secure, he lived disappointed, died in despair, and is now and will forever be, in some world, reaping the bitter fruits of his earthly career.

An instructive picture is here presented to the men, who in any age, and for any consideration, crucify the Son of God afresh, or go against conscience, to secure some temporal interest or please some regnant party in church or state! Oh! how emphatically cheerless the old age, and grand climacteric of a worldling, who sold his conscience and was after all cheated of the promised reward. After the fever and strife of busy life is over, how pitiable is it, to have no good conscience to sustain, amidst the withering of earthly expectations, and the infirmities

and infelicitities incident to old age under the most favorable circumstances. With no pleasing recollections of the past, and a fearful looking for of future and eternal gloom, how terrible the final struggle with "the king of terrors." Even the legendary punishment, to which Irish superstition consigns the legal Destroyer of the Son of God, is a faint picture of the actual doom of all, in after ages, that follow in his footsteps. Condemned, to wander, "in the blackness of darkness," while cycles of ages, are rolling away, with a distinct consciousness of the past, a vivid sense of the present, and fearful anticipation of the future! "Better for that man, that he had never been born," a deeper damnation than Pilate's, on the principle announced by the Saviour, will belong to those, who, in our day, and with all the light now enjoyed, consent for paltry gain, or present popularity or fleeting pleasure, to crucify their consciences, sell their souls and abandon their Saviour. Halts between two opinions, palterers with principle, captives of Satan, deluded votaries, of a world passing away and perishing! Yet even such need not despair, and will not perish, if they do not persevere. Even for Pontius Pilate there would have been mercy and merit enough, had he repented and believed! For the murderers of Christ, who imprecated his blood on themselves and their children, that blood would have availed for pardon and cleansing. "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." For the vilest and guiltiest there are provisions and proffers of pardon, and there is no absolute necessity now that any should perish, provided, they do not procrastinate too long, or finally grieve away "the Holy Spirit, by which we are sealed to the day of redemption."

*Pittsburgh, Pa.*

D. H. R.

## THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL.

[Translated from Schaff's Church History, by T. C. PORTER.]

WE enter now on the history of one, who, as a thinker, is no whit inferior to the most profound philosophers, or, as a hero, to the greatest conquerors of the world, while, as a man, he towers far above them all,—who, as a Christian, by his activity, yea, by his mere conversion, bears more powerful witness to the divinity of the Gospel than whole volumes of scientific argument,—who, as an apostle, unfolds, in by far the most spirited and weighty manner, the peculiarity and catholicity of the Christian religion, as the absolute world-religion, the deliverance of which from the fetters of Judaism and its victory over heathenism had been by him chiefly determined,—who, finally, as a benefactor of mankind, is entitled to the next place after the Saviour of us all, in whose humble service and true fellowship even he found his highest glory and his purest joy.

*Saul* (after the Hebrew), or *Paul* (after the Hellenistic form)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It was a custom of the Jews to have two names, and, in their intercourse with foreigners, to use one either from the Latin, or the Greek, e. g. John, Marcus (Acts xii: 12, 15), Simeon, Niger (xiii, 1), Jesus, Justus (Col. iv, 11). This best explains why the name Paul, appears immediately from that point of time, when he comes forth as the independent apostle of the Gentiles, whilst before and in the first period after his conversion, where Luke followed Palestinian documents, he goes by the name of Saul. But probably he had already used the Græco-Roman form, during his earlier residence in Tarsus. From the more ancient view of *Jerome* (*de vir. illus.* c. 5), which has lately been defended by *Olshausen* and *Meyer*, that Paul assumed this name in thankful remembrance of the first-fruits of his apostolic ministry, the conversion of the Roman Proconsul, Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii, 7), (*apostolus a primo ecclesiæ spolio, Proconsule Sergio Paulo, victoriæ suæ trophæa retulit. erexitque vexillum, ut Paulus ex Saulo vocaretur*), we must dissent for the following reasons: 1. The new name appears before the conversion of Sergius, namely, in Acts xiii, 9, whilst one should wait for its first assumption till c. xiii, 13, to which *Fritzsche* has justly called attention (*Epist. P. ad Roman.* tom. 1, p. xi, note 2). 2. It was indeed the usage of antiquity, to name the scholar after the teacher, but never the reverse (see *Neander Apostel gesch.* 1, p. 135, note). 3. Paul had doubtless before this converted many heathens, even if it be not expressly mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (comp. nevertheless xi, 25–26), since almost nothing is said of his three years' sojourn in Arabia, and his abode in Tarsus is but briefly alluded to. At all events, there is no conceivable reason why the conversion of this proconsul should seem to the apostle worthy of commemoration by a change of name.—In homiletic and practical discourses, it is still usual to refer the double name of the apostle to the great religious contrast of his life, just as the new name of Simon dates

was descended from Jewish ancestors, of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. iii: 5, 2 Cor. xi: 22), and born a Roman citizen (Acts xxii: 28, xvi: 37), probably only a few years after the birth of Christ,<sup>a</sup> at Tarsus, the capitol of Cilicia in Asia Minor, and a celebrated seat of Grecian culture<sup>a</sup> (ix: 11, xxi: 39, xxii: 3). Although set apart for a theologian, he yet learned, according to Jewish custom, a trade, that of tent-making,<sup>a</sup> by which, when an apostle, with noble self-sacrifice, he for the most part earned his own living, so as to maintain his independence and avoid being burdensome to the churches.<sup>a</sup> In his birth-place he enjoyed an excellent opportunity of making himself early acquainted with the Greek language and nationality, which proved of great moment in his subsequent career. And yet, it is not at all likely, that he there received a proper classical training, since the Jewish educational element largely predominates in his writings. He quotes, indeed, several passages from the heathen poets, from *Aratus* (Acts xvii: 28), from *Menander* (1 Cor. xv:

---

itself from his confession of the Messiahship of Jesus, and by its meaning indicates his importance in the history of the church. So, for example, *Augustine* (Serm. 315) draws a parallel between Saul, the persecutor of the Christians, and the persecutor of David (Saulus enim nomen est a Saule, Saul persecutor erat regis David. Talis fuerat Saul in David, qualis Saulus in Stephanum,) and finds in the new name, which he derives from the Latin adjective, paulus, the idea of humility (quia Paulus modicus est, Paulus parvus est. Nos solemus sic loqui: videbo te post paulum, i. e. post modicum. Unde ergo Paulus: "ego sum minimus Apostolorum" 1 Cor. xv, 9). Still more capricious and ungrammatical is the play, referred to by *Chrysostom* (de nominum mutatione), but at the same time decidedly rejected by him, which makes Saul come from σαλευίν sc. ἐκλερρίαν, and Paul from πάρασθαι sc. του δυνάσκειν, so that the first name shall denote the persecution of the Christians and the second its cessation!! Now Saul is confessedly a Hebrew word and means rather, *the longed for, the prayed for*. All these and similar allegorical interpretations are effectually cut off by the fact that Paul, after his conversion, frequently receives from Luke the name of Saul Acts ix: 8, 11, 17, 19, 22, 26, xi: 25, 30, xii: 25, xiii: 2, 9.).

<sup>a</sup> Because when the Epistle to Philemon was written, about the year 63, at the time of his imprisonment in Rome (v. 9), he was an old man, προσηβύτης, perhaps over sixty.

<sup>a</sup> *Strabo*, the contemporary of Augustus Cæsar, in his Geography xiv, 5, places Tarsus, as to philosophy and literature, even before Athens and Alexandria.

<sup>a</sup> Tents were anciently used in various ways, in war, in navigation, by shepherds and travellers, and were mostly made of goat's hair, which in Cilicia was particularly coarse and well suited for this purpose (hence κελτικὸς ἄνθρωπος also signified, a rough man). Comp. Hug. Einl. in's N. T. II, p. 328, 3d ed.

<sup>a</sup> Only from the Christians in Philippi, with whom he stood connected by ties of peculiar friendship, did he accept presents, Phil. iv: 15.

33), and from *Epimenides* (Tit. i: 12). But these quotations might have been picked up, during his later intercourse with the Greeks, or from occasional reading, which must be carefully distinguished from a regular classical education. His deep insight into the essence and development of heathen philosophy and religion, as seen in the Epistle to the Romans and the first Epistle to the Corinthians, may be readily explained on the score of spiritual illumination and extraordinary knowledge of the human heart.<sup>1</sup> Be this as it may, he was sent by his parents, if not when a boy, yet when quite a youth, to Jerusalem, and placed in the school of a wise and learned Pharisee, the celebrated *Gamaliel* (Acts xxii: 3, xxvi: 4, 5), who stood in high repute with the nation (v: 34) and, according to the Talmud, was styled, "The glory of the Law."

Gifted with eminent talents, with creative genius and a rare keenness and energy of intellect, he made himself master of the whole round of Rabbinical learning, which included jurisprudence, as well as theology, and the various modes of interpreting the Bible, allegory, typology, and tradition, as his epistles abundantly shew. By means of this theoretical discipline he was enabled to refute with such wonderful skill the errors of the Pharisees, and, above all the other apostles, to unfold the doctrinal contents of Christianity, in a solid and complete manner. Endowed by nature with an impetuous, resolute character, with the temperament of a religious reformer, the cholero-melancholic, he laid hold of whatever once seemed to him right with all his soul, but for this very reason was prone also to run into harshness and extremes. He was, therefore, a Pharisee of the severest order and a blind zealot for the traditions of the fathers (Phil. iii: 6, Gal. i: 14). Yet he must have belonged to the most earnest and noble of this sect, who in no wise consisted of mere hypocrites, since we find among them a Nicodemus, a Joseph of Arimathea, and a Gamaliel. After the ideal of Jewish piety, as he then conceived it, he aspired with honest sincerity, and hence, when a Christian, he sharply condemned his persecution of the

---

<sup>1</sup> It is possible, certainly, that Paul, at a later period, had studied classic authors, either in the school of Gamaliel, who himself was not averse to Grecian culture, or on his missionary tours, as e. g. *Tholuck* supposes (*Ver-mischte Schriften*, Th. II, 839. p. 275; also Hug, l. c. p. 330); only this cannot be proved from these few quotations, while, if his bigotted Judaism before, and his immense ministerial activity after his conversion, which occupied all his time, be taken into consideration, the opposite opinion is more probable.

church, hence, his deep sorrow on looking back over his former fanaticism, hence he added that it was done "ignorantly" (1 Tim. i: 13), without thereby wishing to extenuate his guilt. Well might he, in his eager pursuit of the more perfect righteousness of the Law, oftentimes feel the conflict in his members, which he has so vividly and faithfully pictured in Rom. ch. 7. These internal struggles no doubt fitted him, after he had attained to the righteousness which is by faith, to exhibit so fully the relation of the Gospel to the Law, man's utter need of salvation, the emptiness of all natural righteousness, and the power of faith in the only Saviour.

At first, Saul might have overlooked Christiannity as an altogether insignificant phenomenon,<sup>1</sup> but as soon as it came forth into open conflict with Pharisaism, as first happened in the person of *Stephen*, it must then have appeared to him, in his gloomy fanaticism, as a despising of the law of the fathers, as a rebellion against the authority of Jehovah, and he, therefore, regarded the uprooting of the new sect as a conscientious duty and a work well-pleasing to God. Hence the active part, which, he, yet a young man scarce thirty years of age, took in the murder of Stephen, and the persecution following. He broke into houses to hunt up Christians. He dragged forth men and women to deliver them over to judgment and cast them into prison (Acts viii: 3, 4, xxii: 4). Not content with this, "still breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," he applied to the high-priest, who was the president of the Sanhedrim, which had the superintendence of all the synagogues and could alone decree the punishment due to despisers of the law, and obtained from him a warrant to arrest all Christians. Armed therewith, he betook himself to the Syrian city of Damascus (ix: 1, on, comp. xxii: 5), whither multitudes had fled and where the Jews had many synagogues.<sup>2</sup> But here the gracious hand of Him, whom he persecuted, was stretched forth, to save and change his whole life: the height of apostasy was to him the crisis of redemption.

On the way to Damascus happened that miracle of grace,

---

<sup>1</sup> It is possible, that he knew Jesus himself, but not probable, since no clear evidence of it is found in his writings. From the passage 2 Cor. v: 16, we can by no means infer it with the same confidence, as *Olshausen* does, comp. *Neander* Apostelgesch. I, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *Josephus* de bello Jud. II, 20, 2, narrates, that under Nero nearly all the women of Damascus were converts to Judaism, and that ten thousand Jews were executed at one time.



which transformed the raging Saul into a praying Paul, the self-righteous Pharisee into an humble Christian, the most dangerous enemy of the church into her most energetic apostle, and sanctified the rich endowments of his nature to the service of the Redeemer. Paul himself in his letters, when handling his Judaistic opposers, more than once appeals to this striking event, as a voucher to his apostolic call, without alluding to the detail, which was well known to the believers to whom he wrote. In the Epistle to the Galatians he asserts with special emphasis, that he was called to be an apostle, not by man, as perchance Matthias, who was chosen by lot to fill the place of Judas, but directly by Christ himself (ch. i: 1), and that he had received his Gospel, to preach it to the heathen, not from human teaching, but by a revelation of Jesus Christ (11-16). With this also agrees 2 Cor. 4: 6, where he ascribes his knowledge to a creative act of God, which he compares to the calling forth of the natural light out of the darkness of chaos. Whether the illumination was merely inward or at the same time accompanied by an external appearance cannot be determined from these passages. But on the other hand, he declares plainly, in 1 Cor. ix: 1, that he "had seen Jesus Christ, the Lord." That he means by this, a real objective appearance is clear from 1 Cor. xv: 8, where he classes it with the other appearances of the risen Lord to his disciples: "Last of all, he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

In the Acts of the Apostles we find three accounts of the nature and manner of his conversion, one from the pen of Luke, ch. ix: 1-19, and two from the mouth of Paul, the first in his speech to the Jewish nation at Jerusalem, ch. xxii: 3-16, the second in his defence before king Agrippa and the procurator Festus during the imprisonment at Cesarea, ch. xxvi: 9-20. They all agree in the main fact, that the conversion was wrought by Christ in his own person. Thus, when Paul drew near to Damascus, suddenly, an extraordinary light from heaven, above the brightness of the mid day sun, shone around him and his companions (xxvi: 13), in which flood of beams he beheld the glorified Saviour (ix: 17, 27, comp. 1 Cor. ix: 1, and xv: 8) and heard his voice speak to him in the Hebrew tongue, "Saul! Saul! why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."<sup>1</sup> Saul, struck to the earth by the over-

---

<sup>1</sup> This customary mode of speaking to oxen and horses: *πρὸς κίνητρα λαλεῖν*, *adversus stimulum calcare*, to kick against the driving goad, can either

whelming power of this appearance, put the question, "Who art thou, Lord?" to which the Saviour answered, He, who looks on every persecution of his disciples, by reason of their life-union with him, as a persecution of himself: "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest; but arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee, what thou must do." When Saul rose up, he saw no one. The supernatural splendor had blinded his eyes. That light, in which hitherto he had fancied himself able to lead all others, was extinguished. As a child, he suffered himself to be led to Damascus, where he remained blind and fasting for the space of three days, in solemn thought and humble prayer for the higher light of grace and of faith. Amid these birth-throes of the new life, he no doubt felt the whole misery of the natural man, the intolerable bondage of the legal standpoint, and in the anguish of his soul cried out: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death (Rom. vii: 23)?" After being thus prepared by "godly sorrow," he was assured within of approaching help and directed by a vision to the man, who would become an instrument to heal both body and soul and bring him into fraternal union with the church. Ananias, an esteemed disciple of Damascus, whom the Lord had prepared by a vision, as he had Peter, at the conversion of Cornelius, bestowed on the praying Saul, through the laying on of hands, his earthly sight, baptism for the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, and made known to him the divine call, that he, as a chosen vessel, should bear to Jews and Gentiles the name of Jesus Christ and by many sufferings for his name become highly honored.<sup>1</sup>

---

denote the subjective impossibility of resistance to the power of divine grace, and furnish, in the view, an argument for the Augustinian doctrine of *gratia irresistibilis*; or, which seems to us more probable, can express the objective fruitlessness of opposition to the church of Christ, founded on an immovable rock. This interpretation is strengthened by the parallel in the speech of Gamaliel, ch. v: 39: "but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

<sup>1</sup> The acknowledged differences, found in the three accounts, on which Baur in his work on Paul p.60, sqq., has laid undue stress, in behalf of his mythical interpretation, concern merely unimportant accessory circumstances, and to every unprejudiced mind serve only to confirm belief and overthrow the hypothesis of subsequent design and calculating reflection on the part of the author of the Acts of the Apostles. 1. In Acts ix, 7, the companions of Paul are said to hear the voice speaking to him, but in xxii, 9, not. This apparent contradiction may be reconciled by simply supposing that his fellow-travellers perceived the sound of the voice, but could not distinguish the articulated words, which were intended for the ear of Saul

Though we turn our eyes away from those theories of this change so fruitful in grand results, which place themselves beyond the stand-point of biblical Christianity, yet the question arises,<sup>1</sup> whether, along with a full recognition of the historical occurrence and of the divine factor, a psychological preparation in the spirit of Paul may not be admitted, since God never works upon man in a magical way. In support of this view we are referred particularly to the echo of the wise counsel of his teacher Gamaliel (Acts v: 38, 39), and to the impression, which the

---

alone. 2. In xxii, 9, (comp. xxvi, 13) his companions are said to see the light beaming around Paul, but in ix. 7, to see no one (*μηδεν*), i. e. no clearly defined form in the blaze of light, which does not in the least conflict with the first representation. 3. In xxvi, 16-18, Jesus himself is said to make known to Paul his being chosen an apostle, whilst this according to both the other accounts, happened through the mediation of Ananias. It may be explained thus, that Paul before Agrippa condensed the narrative for the sake of brevity. And the first representation also is in no wise incorrect, since the communication of Ananias happened at the command of the Lord, and Paul was already directed to it on his way to Damascus (ix. 6).

<sup>1</sup>Here belongs the oft-exploded rationalistic interpretation of *Ammon*, among others, which, wholly against the clear meaning of the text, reduces the supernatural splendor of the glorified God-man to a flash of lightning and the voice speaking in the Hebrew tongue to a peal of thunder, and in the rest sees only the additions of a heated oriental fancy. But no whit better is the mythical theory, lately defended by Dr. Baur, according to which we have here before us no real objective appearance, either natural or supernatural, but merely a subjective transaction, a psychological process. "That light," says Baur, "is nothing else than the symbolical or mythical expression of the certainty of the real and immediate presence of Jesus glorified in heaven" (Paulus p. 68). This view does not rest on historical grounds, but on unproven philosophical assumptions, e. g. on the impossibility of miracles, especially on the denial of the resurrection of Christ, and degrades moreover Paul, that clear, strenuously logical and keenly penetrating spirit into a blind and stubborn fanatic. For Baur cannot deny that Paul, apart from the accounts in the Acts of the Apostles, believed himself, according to 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 18, truly to have seen the Lord, and that the resurrection of Christ was esteemed by him as the most credible and important of all facts, yea, that he declared his preaching and entire faith vain and groundless without it, and Christians "of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. xv. 14-19). Which is more reasonable, to give full credence to the plain statement of such a man, confirmed as it is by the most glorious results, and correct our own philosophy from the history, where they come into collision, or to deny the reality of this fact, and for the sake of certain preconceived opinions, to trace back to a vain image of the brain, to a radical self-delusion, that life the most rich in deeds and full of blessing which history can furnish next to the life of the blessed Saviour, a life, that has already afforded to millions daily instruction, strength and comfort? To decide this we need not appeal to learning and criticism, but simply to the common sense of every candid reader.

discourse and the glorified martyr's form of Stephen and of other persecuted Christians must have made upon him, an impression, of which he immediately strove to rid himself by more violent persecution. But of such preparations just as little trace can be discovered in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul, as of thunder and lightning. Nor are they very probable in view of the energetic and resolute character of the Apostle, who, in his zeal for the law, was firmly persuaded that by the persecution of Christians he did God service and wrought out the salvation of his own soul, and who could only be converted suddenly, or not at all. Over such natures, the Spirit of God comes in earthquake, fire and storm, and not in still, soft whispers. The very suddenness of his transition from bigotted Judaism to the inspired faith of the Son of God reveals to us the peculiarity of his position as Apostle of the Gentiles and representative of the most free and evangelical conception of christianity. And yet, on the other hand, it is true, that his faith in the revelation of the Old Testament, the earnestness of his will, and his honest, though at the same time mistaken, struggle after the honor of God and after righteousness formed an excellent ground-work for the operation of divine grace. For had he not persecuted the christians from ignorance (as he himself says, *Tim. i: 13*), but out of wanton malignity, as a Nero, had he been a frivolous man of the world, as Caiaphas and Herod, or a hypocrite, as Judas, then would no appearance from the world of spirits have ever been able to convert him (*comp. Luke xvi: 31*).

But in what relation did Paul stand to the original circle of the Apostles? The fact, that he was called directly by Christ, without human intervention, and could bear testimony, as an eye-witness, to the resurrection of the Lord, as well as the glorious fruit of his labors, sets his apostolic dignity beyond all dispute. And yet on this account we must either pronounce the election of Matthias to fill the place of the traitor (*Acts i: 15, seqq.*), void, or let go the necessity and symbolical signification of the number twelve. The latter cannot well be done, since Christ has given it special prominence (*Matt xix: 28*, and *Luke xxii: 30*), and only twelve "Apostles of the Lamb" are mentioned in the Apocalypse (*xxi: 14*). Some suppose the number twelve refers only to the Apostles of the Jews, and that Paul, as the thirteenth, should be considered the independent Apostle of the heathen world.<sup>1</sup> But this is not altogether satisfactory,

<sup>1</sup> As Olshausen particularly assumes, in vol. III, of his Commentary p. 5,

because Paul, on the one hand, labored partly among the Jews, and Peter and John, on the other, at a later period, among the Gentiles also, and because even in that case Paul would be passed over with strange neglect in the passage just quoted. Moreover the twelve tribes of Israel are the type, not merely of a part, but of the whole christian church. Rather can we bring ourselves to see in the election of Matthias an act unauthorized, though well-meant. The following considerations seem to favor this supposition: 1. That the election took place before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, hence, before the formal inspiration of the Apostles; 2. That it was brought about by the suggestion of Peter and through human mediation without an express command of Christ; 3. That the name of Matthias is never mentioned afterwards, whilst Paul, an instrument called directly by the Lord himself without the knowledge or concurrence of the disciples, has accomplished more than all the rest of the Apostles (2 Cor. xi: 23, 1 Cor. xv: 10).<sup>1</sup> Be it as it may, it must be admitted, that the whole manner of his call, his position and his ministry, have something in them extraordinary, that will not suffer them to be included in the mechanism of a fixed order.\* And hence he is ever regarded as the chief authority and representative of the free movements of the Spirit in the churches.

With respect to the chronology, among the different periods fixed upon for the conversion of Paul, which differ about a desennium (from a. 31, as *Bengel*, to a. 41, as *Wurm* supposes), that appears to us best, which places this event in the year 37, thus, seven years after the resurrection of Christ.\*

---

sqq. A peculiar modification of this opinion Dr. *Henry Thiersch* takes occasion to bring forward in behalf of Irvingism, which confessedly teaches a revival of the apostolic office for the last times. "Paul is not the thirteenth of the first apostolate, but the first of the second apostolate, which, instituted for the heathen world and the church forming herself out of it, in those ages did not yet come fully into view" (*Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism*, Vol. I, p. 309, vid. 2d ed.).

<sup>1</sup> If Judas, the traitor, did not possess the talents of a Paul, he was yet designed for great things, else Jesus would not have received him into the number of the disciples. The greatness of his original destination may be inferred from his tragic end, just as the grandeur of a destroyed building may be gathered from its ruins. On this, compare my tract on the Sin against the Holy Ghost. 1841, p. 41 sqq.

\* According to the rigid hierarchical view, whether Romish or Puseyistic, the entire non-participation of the apostles, for example, in the ordination of Paul, after his conversion, (Acts ix: 17), and at the time he was sent to the heathen by the congregation of Antioch, (xiii: 3), cannot be satisfactorily explained.

\* And these are our reasons:—1. The statement of Paul, that, three years  
VOL. III.—NO. III. 18\*

after his conversion, he fled from Damascus before the ethnarch of king Aretas, 2 Cor. ii: 32, 33, leads to no fixed terms, because our knowledge of the time of this Aretas and of the history of Damascus is too uncertain. Only this much is clear, that the conversion of the apostle cannot be placed earlier, than a. 34, for Aretas could not well come into possession of the city before the death of Tiberius, a. 37, (on this, comp. *Wieseler*, l. c. p. 167 175). 2. The conversion must have followed not long after the martyrdom of Stephen, which, on account of the tumultuary nature of the proceeding, is best referred to the period just succeeding the deposition of Pilate a. 36, or the beginning of the reign of Caligula (after 37), who in the first year behaved himself kindly toward his subjects, as *Josephus* expressly remarks, *Antiq.* XVIII, 8, 2. 3. A more settled starting-point is afforded by the second journey of Paul to Jerusalem (Acts xi: 29, 30), which could not have happened long before the year 45, because in this year the famine broke out in Palestine, which occasioned the sending of Paul and Barnabas with supplies. Between this and the first mentioned journey of Paul to Jerusalem, Acts ix: 26, about four or five years must intervene, since the apostle had spent, in the meanwhile, a whole year in Antioch (Acts xii: 26) and probably two or three years in Syria and in Tarsus (ix, 30, Gal. i, 21) and some time also in his travels. Now, if the first journey was made in the year 40, the year of the conversion is easily determined, because this took place, according to the statement in Gal. i, 18, three years before, hence in a. 37. But then again our confidence in this calculation is weakened by the fact that neither Luke nor Paul specifies the exact duration of his stay in Tarsus, and conjectures here differ, for whilst *Anger*, for example, allows two years, *Schrader* and *Wieseler*, on the other hand count only half a year. 4. The surest determination of the time seems to lead to the period referred to in Gal. ii: 1, where the apostle says, "fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem." If then, with the majority of interpreters, we begin to count from the conversion as the starting-point, and understand by the journey here mentioned, that to the convention of the apostles (Acts xv), which, according to a reckoning tolerably certain, happened in the year 50 or 51, we reach once more the year 37 as the latest limit for his conversion. But it must be confessed that this calculation can also be rendered doubtful, so long as chronology and exegesis differ so much as to whether we should date the fourteen years from the conversion, or from the first journey to Jerusalem, as well as to whether we should understand by the journey mentioned in Gal. ii, 1, the second (Acts xi, 30, xii, 25) or the third (xv), or the fourth (xviii, 21, 22.). *Wieseler*, for example, endeavors to prove that Paul, in Gal. ii, had in his eye his *fourth* journey to Jerusalem (Acts xviii, 22), and because he places this in the year 54, he obtains, after deducting fourteen years, in agreement with his other combinations, the year 40 as the year in which the apostle was converted. But then it is very difficult for us to admit, that Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, has passed over in complete silence the journey to the convention of the Apostles, when the point of dispute settled in Gal. ii, is so closely connected with it. This is the point in which we must decidedly dissent from the chronological system of this able divine, which we in other respects consider the best and most satisfactory, particularly as regards the life of St. Paul.

## LIFE OF THE REV. DR. MAYER.

LEWIS MAYER was born at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, on the 26th of March, 1783. His father was GEORGE L. MAYER, of that place, a gentleman of liberal education. He was one of several children by a second marriage. His brother, Colonel GEORGE MAYER, is the only one still living, and is one of the oldest and most respectable merchants in Lancaster.

MR. MAYER'S early education was received at Lancaster, the place of his birth, partly under the direction of his father. He applied himself very closely to his studies in general, but gave particular attention to the study of the German language and some eminent German authors. After receiving a respectable German and English education at Lancaster, he determined to leave the place of his birth, and locate in Fredericktown, Maryland. In this place, he engaged for a short time in a secular calling; but having a taste much better suited to *books* than *business*, he did not succeed to any considerable extent. His mind was chiefly occupied with reading and study, and it was thus engaged when he was awakened under the preaching of the pious and excellent WAGNER, then pastor of the Reformed Church at Frederick. His convictions of sin were unusually deep and pungent. He clearly saw his lost and helpless condition as a sinner, and felt himself exposed to the awful wrath of God. He was completely overwhelmed with a sense of sin, and could find no peace, day nor night. The season through which he passed before he could exercise faith and hope in the Redeemer as *his* Redeemer, was indeed one of fearful darkness. He stood, at times, on the very borders of despair, and almost gave himself up as lost. But having been once brought out of darkness into the sweet light of the gospel, and having been led by the Spirit to hope and trust in Christ as *his* Saviour, he soon became a firmly established Christian, and found his chief delight in looking to the Redeemer, and in being engaged in his service. He has often spoken to the writer and others, with great pleasure and interest, of the kind and valuable services rendered him by father WAGNER, in his deep spiritual conflicts, and in preparing him for the high and holy work of the Christian ministry.

Not long after his conversion, MR. MAYER'S mind was impressed with the idea that he was called of God to preach the Gospel, but some considerable time elapsed before he became



fully satisfied that God had indeed called him to the ministry of reconciliation. And this assurance of a divine call to the Christian ministry was not obtained without another painful struggle. He had conflict after conflict, and it was only after great deliberation and much earnest prayer, that his mind rested in a calm and full persuasion that he was called of God to be an ambassador for Christ.

Possessing a high order of native talent, and a mind already accustomed to deep thought and earnest inquiry, he made easy and rapid progress in all his classical and theological studies; and, having completed the prescribed course of study, he was licensed, in 1807, (being then in his twenty-fourth year,) by the Reformed Synod, which met that year at New Holland, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, to preach the gospel. His classical studies were mainly pursued under the direction of the principal of Fredericktown College, and his preparation for the ministry was made under the tuition of the Rev. Mr. WAGNER, Reformed pastor at Frederick; and of this learned and excellent father, who has long since rested from his labors, he always spoke in terms of very high regard and sincere affection. How, or where, Mr. MAYER spent the first year after his licensure, is not exactly known; but it is believed that he was employed in preaching occasionally at Frederick, and some other places in the vicinity.

In 1808, he accepted a call from the Shepherdstown charge, which at that time was composed of the Shepherdstown, Martinsburg, and Smithfield congregations. In this wide and interesting field, he labored, with great acceptance and success, for more than twelve years. Deeply imbued with the spirit of his Master, he went about doing good. His pulpit ministrations, catechetical instructions, and pastoral visitations were all highly acceptable to the people of his charge, and were greatly blessed of God, to the conversion and edification of many souls. He was respected and beloved by all who knew him, and it was mainly through his agency that a new life was brought into that part of the Reformed Church, which to this day is diffusing itself, like holy leaven, more and more. The few members of that charge still living, and who enjoyed the privilege of sitting under his ministry, often speak of him with much affection, and delight in relating the wonderful things which God did through him in the midst of them. He received calls elsewhere, and to prominent points, but he declined them all.

When, in 1810, Mr. WAGNER, in consequence of impaired and declining health, resigned the Frederick charge and remov-

ed to York, that congregation, through its consistory, intimated their unanimous wish to Mr. M., that he should become their pastor; but, as he declined accepting, a formal call was not presented. On Mr. WAGNER's death, he was requested to preach a funeral sermon at Frederick, and complied with the request in January, 1811. The sermon was published by the congregation, and is, it is believed, the first publication that emanated from his pen. It was delivered before a very crowded audience, and was spoken of as such an eulogium as TIMOTHY might be supposed to have pronounced on the personal and ministerial character of ST. PAUL. The impression it made, revived the desire of the congregation to secure his services, but he would not permit himself to be put in nomination.

It was during his ministry at Shepherdstown, that the First Reformed Church in Baltimore also made an effort to secure his services, but without success. He accepted an invitation, indeed, soon after the death of the Rev. Dr. BECKER, which occurred in 1818, to preach to this congregation, and was the first minister that preached a discourse in English in the Second-street Church. That first English sermon did not fail to make a very deep and powerful impression. The occasion was one of high excitement, and the question to be settled was, whether English preaching should be allowed. The preacher, though threatened with violence if he attempted to preach in the English language, stood firm and unmoved, and delivered a discourse of singular ability and appropriateness. In the course of a few weeks, the congregation unanimously called him to become their pastor; but, for reasons satisfactory to his own mind at least, he respectfully declined the call.

Mr. MAYER continued to labor in the Shepherdstown charge, until some time in the year 1821, when he was induced to accept a call from the Reformed Church, in York, Pennsylvania. Among this people, he labored with like acceptance and success, until he was called by the Synod to preside over the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church. For years, the Church had felt the importance of establishing a school for the more thorough preparation of pious and gifted young men for the work of the ministry, and among the foremost and most active of her ministers in planting the much desired institution, was the subject of this notice. During his residence at Shepherdstown he gave the subject his earnest attention, and for a long time it occupied his mind and elicited his prayers and efforts. Enjoying the respect and confidence of the Synod and of the Church, as a pious, learned, and able

minister, he had it in his power to do much towards the establishment of the institution, and all the influence he possessed was cheerfully exerted in its behalf. By correspondence with the Brethren, as well as by fervent appeals on the floor of Synod, he urged the importance of the establishment of a Theological Seminary, and at length he had the high gratification of seeing his efforts crowned with success. His prayers were answered—his wishes realized. The Synod, at their session in Hagerstown, September, 1820, resolved to establish a Theological School, and the Rev. Dr. MILLEDOLLER, of the Dutch Reformed Church, was unanimously invited to the theological chair. He, however, declined the invitation, although strongly urged by Mr. MAYER and other influential divines in the Church to accept it. The Rev. SAMUEL HELFENSTEIN, (now Doctor,) to whom it was then offered, also declined it; and it must be admitted that the inducements to accept the post were not very strong, as, in all new enterprises of the kind, whilst there was much to hope for, there were many difficulties to be encountered. Mr. MAYER himself was finally induced, through the persuasion of leading ministers and members in the Church, to accept a call tendered him by Synod, although he was distrustful of his qualifications to discharge the high duties of the office to which he had been called, as they differed so widely from those to which he had been accustomed. By close application however to study, he soon qualified himself for the new duties he was called to perform.

Having resigned the charge of the York congregation, Mr. MAYER, in obedience to the call of Synod, moved his family to Carlisle, and in May, 1825, commenced operations in the Seminary. The number of students the first session was only five, but there was a gradual increase from year to year. The friends of the institution rejoiced in the prospect which was now opened to the Church for something like an adequate supply of ministers to cultivate her waste places, and to promote her various interests. The professor was popular, and discharged his duties with great fidelity. But the infant institution was but poorly endowed; and this, in connection with other circumstances, which need not be mentioned here, often proved very embarrassing to the incumbent of the theological chair, and indeed to the Synod itself. At length it was deemed advisable to remove the Seminary from Carlisle; and accordingly, at the meeting of Synod, in Lebanon, September, 1820, it was determined to take it to York, whither it was removed shortly after. During the same year, (1829,) the college of the Reformed Dutch Church,

located at New Brunswick, New Jersey, conferred on Mr. **MAYER** the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

The Seminary being now located in a more congenial atmosphere, and less embarrassed than at Carlisle, the students increased very fast, and things assumed a much more promising aspect. A second professor in the Seminary, Rev. Mr. Young, was elected, and a classical school was established, under the direction of Dr. **RAUCH**, which, in the course of a few years, was changed by a State charter into Marshall College. The first president of this institution, was the lamented **RAUCH**. He was also elected as second professor in the Theological Seminary, after the death of Mr. **YOUNG**. During all these changes, Dr. **MAYER** remained steadfast at his post, until the fall of 1835, when the Synod, at its meeting in Chambersburg that year, determined to remove her institutions to Mercersburg, and permanently locate them at that place. Not choosing to follow the Seminary to its place of final destination, chiefly on account of feeble health, he resigned his professorship and remained at York. But in the fall of 1838, at the meeting of the Synod in Lancaster, he was again pressingly invited to take charge of the important situation made vacant by his own resignation. This invitation he accepted—with the understanding, however, that the appointment should be considered only temporary. And such it was. In October of the following year, at the meeting of the General Synod in Philadelphia, Dr. **MAYER** again tendered his resignation, which was accepted. From that time to the day of his death, he continued to reside in York, and was engaged, as far as his feeble health would permit, in preparing several important works for the press.

#### *General Estimate of his Character and Abilities.*

As a preacher, Dr. **MAYER** was learned, able and faithful. His sermons were well studied. He always considered it due to his congregation as well as to himself, that his preparation for the pulpit should be the best he could make. In the early part of his ministry, it was his custom to write and commit his sermons to memory; but in later years, his discourses were studied and preached, without being first written. His preaching generally was plain and practical, solemn and impressive. In the delivery of his sermons he was measured, earnest, and always very serious. His style was clear, chaste, popular,—often argumentative, and sometimes powerful. Possessing a remarkably

clear and correct mind, he was peculiarly happy in his *explanations* of the Bible, and in setting forth the *true sense* of Scripture. He had a taste for *lecturing*, and his expositions of the sacred text were generally very clear, forcible, and able. The writer remembers, that when he was a student at the Seminary in York, a noted Universalist preacher, Mr. T. F., from the eastward, visited the place, and preached several sermons in the court-house, to large audiences. As some appeared to be carried away with the new and strange doctrine, which Mr. F. set forth in a most eloquent and attractive style, the students of the Seminary requested their professor to deliver a discourse in the Reformed Church, on the subject of universal salvation. He cheerfully complied, and selected as his text the *parable of the tares*, and so ably and convincingly did he discuss the subject, that Mr. F. himself seemed half convinced of the truth. On leaving the Church, he remarked to a friend of the writer, that that was the most clear and forcible exposition of the parable he had ever heard, and pronounced the discourse one of uncommon ability and power. The few who at first appeared somewhat taken with the novelties of Universalism were now re-established in their faith, and Mr. F. did not fail to take the first stage that left for Philadelphia. So high an opinion, also, had the Rev. Dr. CATHCART, of York, of the abilities of Dr. MAYER, as an expounder of the sacred volume,—for many years himself one of the most able lecturers on the Bible in the Presbyterian Church,—that, after preaching, as he did occasionally on Sabbath afternoon, to a country congregation some fifteen miles distant, he would return home to attend Dr. M.'s lecture, in the Reformed Church at night, on the holy Scriptures. This venerable and learned divine once observed to a friend, that he considered Dr. MAYER one of the ablest theologians in this country; and this was the judgment of one who knew him long and intimately, and who was therefore well qualified to form a correct opinion of his learning and abilities. Dr. MAYER was indeed "mighty in the Scriptures," and it might be expected, therefore, that his preaching would be of no ordinary character. But he was as *faithful* as he was able. He never shunned to "declare the whole counsel of God." Regarding himself as an ambassador for God, in Christ's stead, and feeling the tremendous responsibility of his high and holy office, "he lifted up his voice, cried aloud, and spared not." To saint and sinner, he preached as one who felt he must give account, and as one on whose faithfulness depended, in a very great measure, the salvation of those who heard him. The weight of precious

souls was upon him, and he labored prayerfully and diligently, both in season and out of season, that they might be saved.

As a *pastor*, Dr. MAYER is said to have been unsurpassed. 'There were none more tender, more affectionate,—none who better understood how to direct the penitent; to encourage the believer; to reclaim the wanderer; to impart comfort to the tempted, the bereaved, the afflicted, and to build up the Christian in the faith and knowledge of the Gospel. His own soul had felt so much of the preciousness of Christ and his great salvation, that he well knew how to impart to others the blessed consolations of Christianity. One who had himself, in his early experience, drunk so deeply of the cup of sorrow, and who had, in the hour of anguish and day of trouble, found peace in believing, and comfort in reposing himself on the bosom of Jesus, might well be supposed to be acquainted with the sources of relief, and to understand how to open the broad and deep channels of spiritual consolation to the broken-hearted and distressed. "He was,"—says one who knew him long and well, and who was once a leading elder in one of his congregations, but now a prominent pastor in the Reformed Church,—“He was always greatly admired and much beloved as a pastor. In the discharge of the various duties of the pastoral office, *none could surpass him*. In the sick-chamber, and in the house of mourning, and in the afflicted family circle, there were none more welcome, none more useful.” Feeble health and other causes often prevented him from giving such attention to pastoral visitation as he desired to give; yet still he performed a large amount of pastoral labor, in visiting the sick, in instructing the young, in comforting and edifying his flock, and in giving attention to the various and important interests of his charge.

As a *professor*, Dr. MAYER was eminently competent. For some thirteen years, he was professor of Theology in the Seminary of the Reformed Church; and during a part of that time, he also gave instruction in the Hebrew language and Church History. And it will be conceded on all sides, that he discharged the duties of that high and responsible office with great ability and fidelity. Dr. MAYER, like many distinguished men of our country, was chiefly indebted to his own untiring industry for his ripe scholarship. He was an excellent linguist, and his acquaintance with various systems of philosophy and theology, both in this country and in Europe—in Germany especially—was very extensive. His mind was peculiarly adapted to the study of biblical antiquities, hermeneutics, exegesis, and didactic, polemic, and pastoral theology. In these studies he excell-

ed—particularly theology. Few, perhaps, could surpass him in *sermonizing*, and in preparing or dictating *skeletons* of sermons. Possessing a thoroughly disciplined and very accurate mind, and apparently at home in every department of the Holy Scriptures—conversant with the various scopes of the sacred authors, and the meaning to be attached to the words they used—it was comparatively an easy thing for him to dictate a good skeleton from the impulse of the occasion. If a skeleton prepared and read by a student did not please him, he would remodel it at once; and if it were too far out of the way, he would lay it aside altogether, and dictate another for him at the time. It was the custom of the class to write down the skeletons thus dictated, and in this way many of them have been preserved. To his class he always seemed well prepared on the recitation, and perfectly at home on all the subjects claiming attention. He “studied to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” On subjects connected with personal piety he would frequently speak to the students, and embraced every fitting opportunity to give them counsel, and to urge upon them the importance of a prayerful and holy life.

Dr. MAYER was known as a *scholar*, *writer*, and *author*. He was a close and earnest student; a deep and correct thinker; a ripe and finished theological scholar, and a clear and extensive writer. For a long time, he edited, with great acceptance, the *MAGAZINE* and *MESSENGER* of the German Reformed Church, and occasionally furnished very ably written articles for some of the leading theological reviews at the North. Among his published works are those on the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*, and *Lectures on Scriptural Subjects*; and among his unpublished manuscripts there is an extensive treatise on *Theology*, another on *Hermeneutics and Exegesis*, and his *History of the German Reformed Church*,—the first volume of which is now given to the public.

But it is peculiarly pleasant to contemplate Dr. MAYER in the light of a *CHRISTIAN*. In early life he sought and found the Saviour. He entered into a solemn covenant with the Lord, to obey his will and to be his faithful and willing servant for ever. He unalterably dedicated himself to his service, and throughout life he was a most consistent and exemplary Christian. Free from all ostentation and pride, from all vanity and lightness of manner, he walked humbly and prayerfully before the Lord, and endeavored to perfect holiness in the fear of God. During an intimate acquaintance with him of eighteen years, the writer



never knew him to indulge in any light-mindedness, or in any trifling behaviour whatever. He was indeed remarkable for his correct Christian deportment, and for his holy walk and conversation. Religion with him was not merely a name; it entered deeply into all his thoughts and feelings—subdued and controlled his will—swayed his judgment, and gave tone and character to all his words and actions. His piety was of a serious, modest, retiring character,—yet withal it was earnest and decided. He seemed to live in God and God in him. The doctrines of grace, of free grace, were always delightfully precious doctrines to him, and he loved to speak about them and to dwell upon them. The righteousness of Christ was his righteousness. He felt that Jesus had died for *him*, and could truly say—

“Jesus, *my* Shepherd, Husband, Friend,  
My Prophet, Priest, and King,  
My Lord, *my* Life, *my* Way, *my* End,  
Accept the praise I bring.”

With St. Paul, he gloried in the cross of Christ, and in that only.

In *public* life, Dr. MAYER was prominent, and shared largely in the respect and confidence of all who knew him. He was honored again and again with important appointments and stations, and for many years was a leading member of the Synod of his Church. He had great influence in the Church, and he did not fail to exert it in behalf of her institutions, and in the promotion of her best interests. To the cause of Christ, in general, he was strongly attached; and the friends of religion everywhere found in him a ready and able advocate of all good things. With a mind deeply imbued with the spirit of his divine Lord, and a heart warmed and swayed by his love, he took an active part in promoting genuine revivals of religion, and in building up the interests of Christ's kingdom in the world. In all his *private* relations, also, he exhibited those virtues and graces which adorn the Christian character and life.

As to his personal appearance, Dr. MAYER was of medium size. He did not measure more than five feet eight inches in height, and his frame was slender and erect. His forehead was very high, and indicated great intellectual strength. His eye was keen and penetrating, and his whole appearance commanded reverence and respect. In his dress, he was plain and very neat. His utterance was easy, but not rapid, and his gait rather slow. He was very regular in his habits, and remarkably syste-

matic and precise in what he did. In all things he was a man of order, and observed great regularity and punctuality in all his business transactions. In his intercourse with others, he was gentlemanly and kind. His manners were always pleasant and agreeable, though somewhat reserved in the company of strangers.

Dr. MAYER was twice married; the first time, during his residence at Shepherdstown; the second time, during his residence at Carlisle. By his first marriage he had six children, three of whom are living, and one of them, a son, JOHN L. MAYER, Esq., is an eminent lawyer, in York. By his second marriage he had no children. His first wife was CATHARINE LINE, the daughter of the late JOHN LINE, of Shepherdstown; and his second wife was MARY SMITH, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who survives him.

#### *His Illness and Death.*

Dr. MAYER did not enjoy good health for many years. He was always, indeed, more or less feeble in bodily vigor; and yet, as a preacher, pastor, professor, and author, he accomplished a great deal. Like BAXTER and others, affliction did not prevent him from being abundant in labors. But, for the last several years of his life, he was not able to accomplish much, on account of his fast-declining health. During the summer of 1849, the dysentery prevailed in York, in the form of an epidemic, and among others whom it attacked was the subject of this notice. The disease, from the first, was violent, baffling the best medical skill, and leaving little or no hope for his recovery. Kind friends telegraphed the writer of his illness, and he hastened to his bedside, to bid him a last adieu. He found him in fierce conflict with the last enemy, and rapidly sinking into his cold embrace. The power of sight, of hearing, and of utterance had failed him, and his physicians said he could not survive till morning. His pulse beat fainter and fainter; and, ere the sun arose, the great and good man had passed away. That which remained was cold and mortal. He died, surrounded by his family and friends, on the 25th of August, 1849, aged sixty-six years, four months, and twenty-nine days. On Monday afternoon, the 27th of August, his remains were followed to the grave by a large concourse of people, and were interred in the cemetery adjoining the Reformed Church in York, and near the grave of the lamented CARES. An address was delivered,

on the mournful occasion, by the writer, and prayer offered by the Rev. Mr. EMERSON, of the Presbyterian Church. The announcement of the death of one so well and so favorably known awakened feelings of deep sorrow and profound regret throughout the whole Church. All felt that a great, and good, and very useful man in Israel had fallen, and that, too, before some of his most important labors on earth were finished. The Master called him home much sooner than the Church had hoped. But even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.

Baltimore, Md.

E. H.

---

#### THE ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

*A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice.* By WILLIAM ADAMS, S. T. P., Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Wisconsin. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1850. Pp. 379, 8vo.

THIS book is eminently entitled to respect. The author belongs to the far West; having charge of the Episcopal Seminary at Nashotah in Wisconsin, an institution founded in missionary zeal and full of promise, as it would seem, for the future, but in the bosom still of the wilderness and far removed from the usual resources of literature and science. The work however is one that would do honor to the oldest and best endowed seat of learning in the country. It carries with it indeed no particular array of authorities, no imposing apparatus of outward scholarship; but it is still evidently the product of very respectable learning throughout, and of this in its best form, the reading and study of other days incorporated by earnest and profound reflection into the very substance and life of the mind itself. Mr. Adams has carried with him to his present retreat, what is of more account than all libraries, the capital of a full European education, with resolution and power to use it vigorously for spiritual ends in the way of private study. He shows himself in this view a thinker, truly worthy of the name and having some right to be listened to with respect. He is not the mere echo on the one hand of what has been spoken or written by others; his thoughts are the living fruit of his own intellectual and moral life; but neither on the other hand does he pretend to spin them with pure originality out of his separate brain, as though the worth of knowledge depended on its being reduced

as much as possible to the character of insulated subjectivity and particular opinion. There are, we all know, cases of such pedantic affectation, where it is pretended, in the sphere particularly of mental and moral science, to ignore and forget, (if we may speak of forgetting what has never been known,) all that others have brought to pass, and to fall in on the resources of purely private thought and speculation, for the solution of all questions and problems in a perfectly independent and original way; under the imagination that such a course discovers more than ordinary intellectual vigor, and is adapted for this reason to command attention and reverential respect. But no such upstart self-born science can ever be of any truly solid and enduring growth. The book before us is of quite a different character. It bears the impress of original thought on every page, beyond most books that have appeared in this country; but it is the originality of ripe previous culture, which is neither self-born nor upstart, but carries with it the authority that rightfully pertains to genuine learning.

As its title imports, the work is devoted to the interest of Ethics. Its general purpose and drift however are not at once clear, either from the title or preface or first few chapters. This forms indeed a serious bar at the beginning to the interest of the book, even for a thoughtful reader prepared to enter earnestly into the subject of which it treats; and is likely of course to stand still more in the way of its popularity, with those whose reigning temper is not of such earnest cast. It requires something of an effort of patience and attention, to become fairly and properly introduced to the object which the author has in view, so as to move along with him freely in the progress of his discussion. Such patience and attention however are sure to be rewarded in the end, with a full compensation for all their cost. The scope and purpose of the work gradually become clear, interest is enlisted more and more in the subject for its own sake, and the result can hardly fail to be for any earnest reader a wholesome discipline of the heart as well as a true benefit for the understanding.

All individual existence, the author tells us in his preface, is conditioned by two elements, first *nature* and secondly *position*—this last including all the relations, in the midst of which and by means of which it fulfils its destiny. To extend this principle upward to the Life of Man, to apply it to his Moral Being, is the object here in hand. "We take it for granted herein," he says, "that man has a moral nature and constitution, as well as an animal and intellectual being; and that to man as a moral

being there are external facts and institutions that correspond to this moral nature. This treatise seeks to discover, define, and specify distinctly, the various faculties of the moral constitution of man, and so to classify them that they may assume a definite scientific and practical form. And to do this, it considers them in the two-fold point of view, as in themselves first, and secondly their relation to those other external fixed facts which bear upon moral life, as the external circumstances of physical nature do upon the powers of vegetable or animal existence. This, as I have said, is my leading principle, and in reference to this it is, that I define Ethics to be the Science of Man's Nature and Position."—P. 5.

The work is divided into six books. In the first we have a consideration of the nature of Man, under the general inquiry, *Is it good or evil?* The author finds it to be constitutionally good; that is not indifferent to good and evil, like that of brutes, not essentially evil like that of devils, and not dualistically compounded of two different substances one good and the other evil. Some writer, noticing the work in a late number of the *Church Review*, takes exception to this representation, as not being in his apprehension altogether orthodox. It is admitted that Mr. Adams affirms in the most unqualified way the fact of Original Sin; but his view of the essential character of the fallen nature of Man is held to be at variance with the proper force of this fact as taught in the Articles of the Episcopal Church. The true doctrine is, we are told, "that the Will, the Affections, and the Reason, are not now essentially good; that they are vitiated and evil, by an infection which extends to their very nature; that what they need is, not *mere position*, where their own inherent and essential life may develop itself; but, over and beyond all this, the implantation or bestowal of a new and supernatural Element—the imparting of a life which did not before exist, as well as to wash away the stain and guilt of original defilement." Mr. Adams, it is added, "has but re-echoed the sentiments of a certain Dr. Taylor, in his famous 'Concio ad Clerum,' which a few years ago set Congregationalism in New England into a blaze; prompted to the organization of the East Windsor Seminary, &c." Nay, he goes even beyond Dr. Taylor; for whereas this last stopped with simply denying the Evil in Human Nature, Mr. Adams actually affirms the Good. The opponents of Dr. Taylor, according to the reviewer, have not scrupled to charge upon him nothing more nor less than rank Pelagianism; and he has no hesitation in saying, that he too finds it impossible to look upon what Mr. Adams says on this subject in any more favorable light.

But if we have not wholly missed the sense of our author, this criticism is entirely unjust, and proceeds itself on a theological conception which is anything but sound and right. The position maintained here with regard to human nature is not that of Pelagius, and by no means re-echoes simply the doctrine charged on Dr. Taylor. That there is "a fault and corruption of the nature of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam," and that this infection "hath of itself the nature of sin," according to the Anglican Confession, Mr. Adams, we presume, has not for a moment thought of calling in question. The idea of such a real corruption of our nature as makes righteousness forever impossible without the implantation of a new and higher life, runs through his whole book. But what he feels it necessary to guard against, is the imagination that this corruption involves such a depravation of the very substance or essence of man's nature as leaves it in itself incapable of a true moral restoration to righteousness and life. This is the Manichean error, which has by no means gone out of date with the old sect so called, but under new names and phases, like the Pelagian heresy itself of which it is the natural reverse, continues to make itself felt in the Church through all ages. There is a certain style of orthodoxy which is particularly exposed to the danger of falling into this extreme, from the very merit it is disposed to make of its opposition to the wrong which lies on the other side. It measures its zeal for the supernatural character of Divine grace, in the work of salvation, by the extent to which it carries its depreciation of all that belongs naturally to the human subject. Man must be shorn of all goodness, and turned into a demon or a brute, in order to put the more honor, as is supposed, on the power that accomplishes his redemption. But of what account is it to avoid Pelagianism in this way, if in doing so we fall into the arms of Manicheism? Will it magnify the idea of Man's salvation, to conceive of his nature as so lost and depraved that it is in itself no longer capable of being inwardly unfolded to righteousness, but requires for this purpose a re-creation, or new physical construction, imparting to it a wholly different essence? It is one thing surely to say that man cannot save himself, and quite another that he has in himself no capability of being saved even when acted upon by a higher power. The realness of the Christian redemption, as an article of faith, involves both of these conceptions, and falls to the ground with equal necessity by the loss of either. The nature of man is so fallen as to be truly and wholly disabled for righteousness, without the descent into it of a higher

principle from Christ; and still, in the midst of this ruin, it remains salvable, capable of redemption, susceptible of being entered and wrought upon restorationally by this heaven descended grace; which it would not be certainly, if it had become intrinsically brutish or diabolical. To conceive of man's redemption as analogous with a fiat of omnipotence, turning an ox for instance into a pious saint by a miracle of mere power, is to rob the whole mystery in truth of its proper sense. Redemption is not strictly creation, the making of one thing into another absolutely new and different; but the deliverance rather of that which has been restrained and oppressed into its rightful freedom, and the advancement of it thus to its own true perfection. It lies then in the very fact of our human redemption itself, that our human nature, though fallen, is still neither essentially evil nor indifferent to good and evil, but in itself good, and so capable of being recovered by Divine grace to the holiness and glory for which it was originally created.

This we take to be the whole sense of Mr. Adams' doctrine on this subject; which seems to us to be very plainly also the doctrine of the Bible, as well as the view that has the best right to be considered orthodox in the sense of the old Catholic Church, as holding midway between the Pelagian and Manichean extremes, one full as much at war with the true grace of the Gospel as the other. The highest idea for man is Moral Good, and this comes into view fully only in God. The goodness of our nature, that which still shows in us the image of God notwithstanding the fall, and that which makes room thus for our redemption although left to itself it could never originate or produce any such deliverance, appears in the inward determination with which it is carried towards God always as its proper end and rest. Wherein consists then the acknowledged fact of the *fall*? In the withdrawal of that Presence of God which formed for man, in his state of innocence, a natural rule of life and complete law of action; and then in the disorder and insubordination of our natural faculties, following this in the way of consequence. "Here then we are able to answer the question, How is it that man does evil, although in his nature he is good?—Simply it is this, that the very fault and deficiency of his nature is in the *natural inability* to do that which is in accordance with the Will and Law of God; in other words that which is Good. His nature is good, and aspires towards it; the Law that speaks to him is good. Tradition teaches him of Good; all things call forth the desire and the will, but the *ability* is wanting by nature."



The nature of man is complex, made up of various powers and activities. Still as thus manifold its true form requires at the same time an absolute unity. This depends on a certain inward relation and harmony of its several parts. Hence the distinction of governing powers and subordinate powers. Neither of these are in themselves naturally bad ; but where the due relation that should hold between them is lost, we have necessarily a state of evil on both sides. The governing powers, according to our author, are the will, the conscience, the affections, the reason ; the powers that should obey are passions, desires, feelings, appetites, instincts. "Now herein is man's nature of itself, in consequence of the Fall, weakened, that the lower faculties, the passions, desires, feelings, appetites, instincts, these tend to assume the place of the higher, and themselves *to rule* when they ought *to be ruled*. And secondly, the ruling faculties are weakened so as to permit this insubordination."

One of the last charges that can fairly be brought against the book before us, we think, when rightly understood, is that of reducing in any way the force of the old church doctrine of Original Sin. Most solemn stress is laid upon it practically in every part of the discussion. "There is a moral inability to keep God's law perfectly," we are told, "an inability born with us, and which we clearly see not to have belonged to man's nature originally, but to have been the *result of a deterioration*, which is called the Fall. This inability is in the infant ; it develops itself in him just as soon as reason and responsibility begin to develop themselves. And the great end of remission, of forgiveness, of reconciliation, is the putting an end to this inability, *not in itself*, but in actual transgression, and in its own guiltiness. The fact of the inability, and of its origin, every one can see from his own nature.—The nature of Original Sin, the cause of this inability, we do not clearly know in this world, even our deepest imaginings cannot penetrate it. The very consideration of it is involved in the deepest mystery. It would seem that there is a hideousness and horror about it more fearful than we can imagine, when we think that for its remission and pardon the Eternal Word must take flesh, and be born, suffer, die, and be buried, that it should be remitted. It would seem, too, that if we could only comprehend it, sin is ultimately an *actual and real death*, of which the death of this world is only the shadow. It would seem also to be of the nature of an infection, reaching from generation to generation, and from father to son, extending as a disease, loathsome of itself in the eyes of God and Man. It would seem also as if it tainted the nature

of all men as unquestionably the infected nature of diseased animals, although undeveloped, still is in their offspring. It would appear also that there is some impenetrable and mysterious connection, as it were, between the souls of all men—between our souls and the souls of all our progenitors, and consequently with the souls of them in whom the deterioration took place.” —P. 63, 64.

Again : “The inordinacy that comes from Original Sin, and inability to be obedient to the Law of God, run through *all parts* of man’s nature—‘the whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint’—and the Body is wounded as the Spiritual part is. But the one is not in its nature wholly or essentially evil any more than the other. The Body with its powers is in its nature good, but fallen, just as the whole man is; nay, there is not a function, or a desire, or appetite, or instinct of the Body, that is not in itself good, when it is guided and governed by the Law of God. This is the decision of the Ancient Church against the Manicheans, a decision worthy to be brought up again and again, and impressed and urged upon all men as one of the primal truths of a real Christian Science.”—Over and above the curse of natural death, the animal mind, or as others call it the understanding, that is the mental power as occupied with the things of sense, is found to be disabled. “And this, we can see, has taken place in a twofold way: the first by a superinduced imperfection in the action of its faculties; and the second, by an actual diminution of them in number.” In this last case the idea is, “that originally there were in man’s nature powers and faculties of body and mind which now he does not possess; and that these powers having been fully developed, and in full operation, in the Primal Man in his state of Original Righteousness, have, by means of the changed relation of man to all things in consequence of his sin, *shrunk back, as it were, into his being*, and been withered up, until hardly the vestiges and indications of them remain. So that with regard to man, we may say, in reference to those powers and capabilities that they *lie folded up in his being*, never coming to maturity of action or ripeness, as the germ of the fruit in buds that never come to flowers, or as the wings and plumage of the butterfly in the chrysalis, or as the ramifications of trunk and branch, twig and foliage, in the acorn of the oak.” This seems to be the case in reference to a multitude of powers, “whose existence and nature we can hardly guess at, save in the one way of analogical conjecture that they must have been of those that bound the external world in obedience to his commands. The being, nature, and extent of

these powers, what they are, or how, in what condition they would place man if *now* called forth, seems to be wrapped up in utter darkness; but that such have an actual existence as *possibilities*, it seems to me all things around us, by their analogies, lead us immediately to conclude."—P. 241-246.

The most jealous orthodoxy, we should think, can have no good reason to complain of the teaching of Mr. Adams, on the score of the article here in question, though he *does* take pains to show that man, in his fallen state, has not become either a fiend or a brute.

The second book is devoted to the consideration of *Conscience*, the first of the four governing powers in man's nature; the third to the *Spiritual Reason*; the fourth to the *Heart or Affections*; the fifth to the *Family or Home and its Affections*; the sixth to the *Human Will*. Under each of these heads we have several chapters of excellent thought, and a fund of rich practical observation well fitted to make the reader both wiser and better. The whole subject is handled at the same time in the way of life, rather than as a matter of speculation. It is made to carry with it the form of an earnest direct appeal continually to the experience of those who read. The general character and spirit of the work in this view may be learned from the following extract:

"There is one especial difficulty about Ethics, in that it is a science of which each one has the requisite knowledge in his own consciousness; and the presentation of it, then, in an external systematic form, is almost impossible. The business therefore of the writer, so far as he can, is to present the truths in such a manner, that each one may recognize them as facts of his own nature, and accede to the rules drawn forth by the author; but for putting it in a mechanically systematic order, it is a thing which the very nature of the science forbids. The true system in it is not of external arrangement, but of internal sequence, so that fact shall lead to fact, and principle be made a foundation-stone to principle: that so the reader shall be led to think upon his own nature, and to see by it that the principles of the science are true. For often it happens that a fact or truth shall be denied by him under the influence of prejudice or of ignorance, which had he seen it in its ethical connection with others of which he would make no doubt, though they have never been brought up consciously to his mind, he would at once have acknowledged to be true. Let not the reader then expect this external, mechanically systematic order from us; we are content if we present the various truths of Ethical Science in the peculiar systematic method which we have described above—

that form which we feel most appropriate to a science, all the facts of which are in existence in each one's breast."—P. 187.

The aim and scope of Mr. Adams' work are in the fullest sense churchly and christian. It does not propose however to be a direct exhibition of the idea of religion, as this springs from the grace of the Gospel. The author himself is careful to tell us, that Practical Christianity, as it is reached by human nature in covenant with God, forms a higher sphere of truth to which the discussion here presented must be taken as simply preliminary and introductory.

"The Ethics of a human being endued with this high privilege, placed in this lofty position, while manifestly it is *not opposite* to that of the man who is of nature only, not of grace—has only the capabilities instead of the gifts, but is the crowning and completion of it—is still something infinitely higher and infinitely more perfect. As the stately palm in the desert, crowned with its diadem of leaves at once, and flowers and fruit, is to the date borne in the hand of the wandering Arab, so is the true science of the Christian Life to the loftiest and truest philosophy of Nature apart from Grace. In both cases, it is true, the germ exists the same, but in the latter the influences are wanting that shall develop it. That germ in the case of the natural man, the spiritual nature that is in him existing, which renders him capable of grace, I have in this book treated of. Spiritual Ethics, the ethics of man in covenant with God, is a distinct and higher part of the same science, and is practical Christianity. At some future time, in the ripeness of maturer years and by the light of fuller knowledge, I may enter upon the examination of this loftier science."—P. 375, 376.

Here again the Reviewer before noticed affects to find a theological latitudinarianism. He will have it, that morality is a word of no meaning short of full Christianity. "Here in our judgment," he tells us, "is the grand mistake of the writer, which runs through his entire book. He has looked first upon human nature, its condition, character, susceptibilities and capabilities, in a *humanitarian* rather than a Christian aspect, and has based its moral training upon its natural capabilities, rather than upon its supernatural relation and assistances." Again: "Mr. Adams would have been truer to his title, had he at once thrown aside every thing like a mere human philosophy, and contemplated human nature, not in its original or fallen state merely, but also as redeemed, and brought henceforth into new relations, and under new and supernatural influences. In doing

this, he would we think have been guarded from positions, which seem to us erroneous and exceedingly unfortunate."—But this is to wrong egregiously both Mr. Adams and the subject of his book. It is not true, that he pretends to construct a science of man's moral nature on simply humanitarian ground, or that he has no regard to redemption as the necessary condition of morality and virtue in any complete form. On the contrary, his work is designed and well suited to shut men up to Christ, and to lead to him pedagogically, from beginning to end. It goes however on the assumption that Christ came, not to destroy, but to fulfil the sense which belongs to man's nature naturally considered; and that to understand this properly, is the surest way of seeing and feeling the necessity of that higher economy of supernatural grace and power, which is brought to light through him by the Church. Morality is not at once Religion, and still less Christianity; although it is perfectly true, that it can never complete itself except under this high form. Christianity does not bring into man his ethical nature, his moral necessities and capabilities, as though he were before a tree or a beast; it finds him with all this, and proves itself to be from God by meeting it with the power of a higher life, the complement of supernatural grace, whereby alone it can be redeemed from the law of sin and raised into true freedom. There is fair reason then, and full room, for such a study of Man ethically taken, as Mr. Adams here attempts, in the way of propædæutic discipline to the full science of Practical Christianity; and the censure which we have just quoted strikes us, accordingly, as altogether more nice than sound.

We close with a brief extract from the *Concluding Remarks* of the author, which may serve still farther to illustrate his somewhat quaint style, as well as the general aim and spirit of his work:

"I must now, in all justice to my reader, tell him that the system I have here laid before him is not a system of my own, invented by myself, but that it is the Ethical Science of the first Christians, as far as I have been able to distinguish and feel it. This I have, as it were, translated into the thought of our age and time, out of the thought of men of different ages and different times. That is, I have attempted to present, in a scientific form, as a *system*, before the ordinary reader, the Ethics of Christianity, as held by the Church unbroken, before the ambition of Rome and the pragmatical spirit of Constantinople had rent the Church in two. —If the reader who has gone thus far is contented with it, thinks

that it gives a sufficient and satisfactory account of Human Nature, its problems and their solution, in the first place I claim from him no praise, personally in this book. I profess to present the Ethics of the Ancient Church. Augustine, Athanasius, Cyril, Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, these men whom every puny writer of the present day thinks himself privileged to scorn at—these are the sources from which I have obtained the principles here presented in a connected form; men who, often by the meditation of a whole life of holiness and self-denial, thought out and established forever the Christian solution of a single one of the problems of nature herein discussed. These results the theologian will often discern, in these pages, given in a few lines, while, in the original, volumes hardly embrace their discussion. For myself therefore I claim no praise of originality or genius; but that one of bringing again before the world, in a shape to every one tangible, the Ethical Science of Apostolic Christianity, undivided and at unity with itself.—So far with regard to myself I have said to him, who has thus far read the treatise with satisfaction; now, *with regard to himself*, I say, if he be convinced of the truth of these principles, let him not for a moment abide in a barren philosophy, but *act upon the principles* herein laid down. Let him begin to cultivate his Spiritual Inward Nature at all risks, and under all pain and loss to make it the ruling and supreme governor of his action.—The author has now come to the end of a laborious work, which he felt to be needed. He has worked upon it sincerely and ardently, for he knew of no book embracing the subjects treated upon herein, so as to be accessible to the mass of readers and at the same time pleasing to them. How he has succeeded time will tell; but if the reader feels that the author has so far succeeded as to supply, even in a small degree, the great want of a book upon these subjects, the author would ask of him *not to let the book rest upon his shelves*, but to bring it before the notice of those to whom it is likely to be of service."

J. W. N.

## SCHAFF'S CHURCH HISTORY.

*Geschichte der christlichen Kirche von ihrer Gründung bis auf die Gegenwart. Dargestellt von PHILIP SCHAFF, Professor der Theologie in Predigerseminar zu Mercersburg in Pennsylvanien. Matth. xiii: 31-33. Erster Band: Die allgemeine Einleitung und die erste Periode, von Pfingst-feste bis zum Tode des heil. Johannes. (a. 30-100.)* Mercersburg, Pa.: Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Zu haben bei: Ernst Schäfer in Philadelphia und Leipzig; Rudolph Garrigue in New-York. 1851.

THE appearance of this work deserves to be considered certainly something of an event. It is the first volume of what proposes to be a full History of the Christian Church from its origin down to the present time, replete with German learning and written in the best and purest German style, worthy in this respect to compare with the first productions of like character in Germany itself and sure to be received with respect among leading scholars in that land of literature and science; and yet it is in full an American work, brought out in a retired American village, where it was necessary even to create the press that was required for its publication, and designed primarily for the use of a public on this side of the Atlantic. For those who are at all acquainted with the difficulties that were to be surmounted in the case, the execution of such a work, and the highly respectable style in which it appears, cannot fail to be taken as highly complimentary to the resolution, patience and persevering diligence of the author, no less than to his learning and scholarship. The outward show of the book is in all respects neat and handsome, and well suited to the dignity of its subject and theme. Its real substantial worth however lies of course in its contents; and we have no doubt that the estimate put upon it in this view by all competent judges, will be favorable in the highest degree.

The work bears upon it the marks of true learning and vigorous independent thought from the first page to the last. In the nature of the case a Church History may not pretend to absolute originality; it must go over the same field of matter and fact that has been already passed over by many previous works of the same sort; and to make no account of what has been thus done by others, would be to forfeit from the start all claim to rational respect. The author before us affects no such false and weak singularity; but owns in full what may be called the *historical* character of the science of Church History itself, aiming



to understand its objective movement from the beginning down to the present time, and so to throw himself with free clear consciousness into the stream which thus unites in itself the wealth and strength of this art as it has been cultivated by other hands, the results of experience and study handed forward from other times. Very special account is made in this way of the labors of *Neander*, in whom the previous course of the science may be said to have reached a new grand epoch, and to have found a depth and comprehensiveness of meaning of which the world had no knowledge before. Dr. Schaff takes pains to acknowledge his obligations to the learning of this great man, and still more to his genius and spirit. It was desired from the first to bring out the work in some connection with his name, and as it were under the auspices of his paternal friendship; and he was solicited accordingly at the outset for permission to address it to him in the way of dedication. This permission was granted in the most friendly terms; but in the mean time, alas, the venerable *Neander*, to the grief of the whole Christian world, has been snatched away by death; and the work before us is now dedicated only to his MEMORY: "*Dem Andenken des seligen Dr. August Neander, Vaters der neueren Kirchengeschichte.*" In this title, father or patriarch of Modern Church History, he may be regarded as by universal consent now fairly and firmly established. No writer after him can deserve regard, who shows himself ignorant of his labors or insensible to their high and enduring value. To admit this however in his favor and to own as he also was ready to do the value of other and older services in the sphere of the same science, is not to preclude by any means the idea that there is room and need still for farther progress in its cultivation. The proper merit of such a genius as *Neander*, is not that he has exhausted and brought to an end the art of which he appears the father, taking away thus all opportunity for others to do more than repeat his work, but this rather, that he throws open to the human spirit a new stadium of activity, and imparts to it at the same time the stimulus of a fresh enthusiasm, by which it is encouraged and impelled to proceed still farther with new and independent movement in the direction of such salutary impulse. This is the relation in which the work before us stands to the historical authority of its own science, in the view now noticed. It is the birth and product truly of that *Modern Church History*, of which *Neander* is acknowledged to be the presiding genius and great ruling star. But with all this, it is no loose compilation merely or servile copy, either in whole or in part, of what has been written by others. It is truly an

independent and original work, the fruit of active personal study, a genuine creation of art, having its own form and spirit from beginning to end. Whatever it may owe to others, all has been evidently reproduced in the way of living thought, and appears under a character of fresh and glowing interest springing in this way directly from the life of the subject itself. The author has his own theory and scheme, his own method, his own order and proportion, and his own style. In all this too, so far as he has yet gone, we consider him eminently successful. His work is at once thoroughly learned and strikingly plain and popular. This last advantage it owes, both to its clear distribution of topics and its nervously compact and direct style, intermediate we may say between the aphoristic sententiousness of *Hase* and the heavy lumbering periods of *Guericks*. It is of a decidedly better form in this respect, particularly for American use, than the great work even of Neander; for it lay in the whole character of this great and good man, in his supreme regard to the *inward*, the spiritual soul and substance of things, to overlook and neglect even to downright slovenliness itself the claims of the outward and formal in almost every respect. He paid no earnest attention whatever either to method or style, but like the old African father Tertullian seems to have shrunk rather from every such rhetorical care, as a sort of outside nicety in which a christian should take no concern. The consequence is, that the charm of his works lies wholly in the power by which he has been able to throw into them the very life of his own soul, and is exerted continually in spite of his style—which is for the most part loose and clumsy in the extreme. The work before us labors under no such objection. On the contrary it is a model of historical order and clearness.

We have here the first volume only of a work, which is expected, when complete, to embrace the entire history of the Christian Church from its foundation down to the present time. To write such a history is a great undertaking, not to be completed under years of persevering study and labor, and subject to many difficulties and uncertainties, of which our author seems to have full sense, and in view of which he is properly cautious as regards binding himself with absolute promises for the future. We trust that his life may be spared for the work, and that he may have ample encouragement and fair opportunity to fulfil in due time the whole measure of his present plan. His taste and talent seem happily joined to qualify him for such a service, and to urge him towards it as his proper mission; while there can be no question of its high importance, as deserving to the fullest

extent all the diligence and zeal that may be required for its accomplishment. At the same time however, there is no reason for considering the full and final completion of so large a plan necessary in any way to the completeness and value of the several portions of history of which the whole is to be composed, provided only these portions are made to embrace in a full and sufficient manner periods that are actually in their own nature thus separate and distinct. In this view, the volume here in consideration forms in truth, not the fragment simply of a full Church History, but a work which may be regarded as finished and complete for the period to which it is devoted, (as much as this can be said to be the case with *any* history,) even if the author should be prevented hereafter from executing in full his present plan. It is occupied simply with the Apostolical Period, the founding of the Church and its first fortunes as they come before us in the writings of the New Testament. No period can be more important or full of interest; for as it forms historically the introduction to the whole subsequent development of the Christian life, it is plain that the knowledge we have of it, and the view we take of it, must condition materially always our judgment of the history of the Church in all following ages. For this reason also the treatment of this period, above that of any other, should be made to carry a separate form, and to appear as in the case before us in the character of an independent and distinct work, introductory to the General History of later times, but without subjection to any of the ecclesiastical schemes that come in necessarily to influence the view taken of this later history in all its parts.

To form some conception of the importance and interesting character of this first volume of Dr. Schaff's History, it is sufficient simply to glance at its general plan and division, and to consider the several subjects and topics that are made to pass in lively succession before the eye of the reader. It commences with a masterly and well digested Introduction, reaching through seventy eight pages, and embracing the following scheme of chapters and sections: I. *History*—1. Its conception; 2. Its factors; 3. The central position of religion in history. II. *The Church*—1. Idea of the Church; 2. Its development; 3. The Church and the World. III. *Church History*—1. Definition; 2. Compass; 3. Relation to other branches of theology; 4. History of the growth and persecution of the Church; 5. History of doctrine; 6. History of practical religion, government and discipline; 7. History of worship; 8. Sources; 9. Compensation for the study of sources; 10. Method of historiogra-

phy; 11. Division of Church History; 12. General characteristics of the three grand eras of Church History; 13. The uses and advantages of the science. IV. *The Progress of Church History as a Science*—1. Church Historians before the Reformation; 2. Roman Catholic Historians; 3. Protestant Historians to the time of Semler; 4. Protestant Historians since Semler.—The entire history of the Church, from the beginning down to the present time, is divided into three grand eras, each falling again into as many separate subordinate periods. The first era is that of the PRIMITIVE or GRÆCO-LATIN UNIVERSAL CHURCH, extending from the Day of Pentecost to the time of Gregory the Great, (a. 30–590); embracing as its three periods the *Apostolical Church*, to the death of the Apostles, the *Church under Persecution*, to the time of Constantine (a. 311), and the *Church of the Græco-Roman Empire*, amid the storms of invasion and revolution which brought on finally its fall. The second era is that of the CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES or of ROMANO-GERMANIC CATHOLICISM, reaching from the time of Gregory down to the Reformation (a. 590–1517); with its three periods of the *Commencement of the Middle Ages*, the planting of the Gospel among the Germanic nations on to the rise of Hildebrand (a. 1049), the *Bloom of the Middle Ages*, the palmy period of the Papacy, Monasticism, Scholasticism and Mysticism, on to the time of Boniface VIII. (a. 1303), and the *Decline of the Middle Ages* opening the way to the Reformation. The third era finally is that of the MODERN or EVANGELICAL PROTESTANT CHURCH in conflict with the ROMAN CATHOLIC, from the Reformation to the present time; having for its subordinate periods, the *Reformation* or *Productive Protestantism*, as it appears in the sixteenth century, *Orthodox Scholastic Protestantism*, characteristic of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth, and *Unchurchly Negative Protestantism*, (Rationalism and Sectarianism,) preparing the way transitionally for a new era.—The volume now offered to the public, it will be perceived, is occupied altogether with the first period simply of the first era in this scheme. It confines itself, as before said, to the consideration of the Apostolical Church.

Here we have again an Introduction, looking directly to the history in hand. This brings into view the general relation of Christianity to the previous state of the world, the historical preparation for it which went before in the form of Paganism as well as in that of Judaism—the Grecian culture, its decline, Platonism, the Roman empire, its interior state, Stoicism—the Old Testament Revelation, the political condition of the Jews when

Christ came, their religious state—the influence of Judaism on Paganism, and of this last again on the first—all conspiring to show the need of Christ and to make room for his coming.

Book First, in the next place, treats of the founding of the Church, its spread and persecution, under a division of five chapters. Chap. I. sets before us its proper *Birth-Day*, the miracle of Pentecost, the gift of tongues, the preaching of Peter and its memorable results. Chap. II. has for its title, *The Mission in Palestine* and the Way Opened for the Conversion of the Gentiles—with the topics: The fortunes of the Church at Jerusalem; Stephen, the first martyr; Christianity in Samaria and the ministry of Philip; The conversion of Cornelius; Commencement of the mission among the Gentiles; The congregation at Antioch, and rise of the Christian name. Chap. III. is devoted to the life and labors of the *Apostle Paul* and the planting of the Gospel among the Gentiles, in a series of sections, extending through more than a hundred pages, that serve to bring into view all the leading occasions of his history and the various important relations of his ministry to the progress of the Christian cause. His early character and education, his conversion, his call to the apostleship, his missionary activity, his various journeys, his epistles, his controversies with heretics, his manifold persecutions and trials, all receive proper consideration. Here also various chronological questions and other doubtful points of history are examined with no small amount of learned diligence and labor. Chap. IV. treats of the *Labors* of the other *Apostles* on to the Destruction of Jerusalem: The character of *Peter*; his position in the History of the Church; his later labors; his epistles; his residence at Rome and martyrdom; *James*, the Just; the Epistle of James; Traditions concerning the Apostles; The overthrow of Jerusalem. Chap. V. gives us the *Life and Work of St. John*; his birth and education; his apostolical activity; his banishment under Domitian to Patmos; his return to Ephesus and the close of his life there; his character as compared with Peter and Paul; his writings—Gospel, Epistles, Apocalypse.

Book Second has for its general subject the Practical Religious Life of the first Christians. Chap. I. *The Influence of Christianity on the Moral Relations*. Topics: The new creation; The Apostles; Family life; Marriage and celibacy; Christianity and Slavery; Christian Brotherhood; Social and National Life. Chap. II. *Spiritual Gifts*. Chap. III. *Church Discipline*.

Book Third is an interesting view of the Government and

Worship of the Apostolical Church. Chap. I. *The Ministerial Office in General*. Topics: Its origin and design; Its derivation from the apostolate—distinction into church and congregation offices; Election and ordination of officers; Support of ministers; Relation of officers to the congregations. Chap. II. *Church Officers*: The apostolate; Prophets; Evangelists.—Chap. III. *Congregational Officers*: Presbyter-bishops; their office; Deacons; Deaconesses; Angels of the Apocalypse.—Chap. IV. *Divine Service*. Topics: Signification of Christian worship and its relation to the Jewish; Sacred places and seasons; Sunday; Year Festivals; Separate parts of Worship: Baptism; Infant baptism; The Lord's Supper; Other Sacred Rites.

Book Fourth treats of Doctrine and Theology. Chap. I. *The Apostolical Literature and Theology in general*: Origin of the New Testament—The Historical Books—John and the other Evangelists—The Acts of the Apostles—Didactic Writings—The Apocalypse—Organism of the Apostolical Literature—Language and Style of the New Testament. Chap. II. *The Apostolical Types of Doctrine*: Origin and Unity of the Apostles' Doctrine—Difference—Jewish and Gentile Christianity—Jewish Legal type of James—James and Paul—Jewish Prophetic type of Peter—Matthew, Mark and Jude—Gentile type of Paul—Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews—Ideal type of John. Chap. III. *Heretical Tendencies*: Conception of Heresy—Division and general character of Heresies—Typical Signification of the Apostolical Church.

We quote in conclusion a portion of the author's Preface, exhibiting his own idea of the work he has undertaken and its general purpose or plan:

"To portray with conscientious fidelity to original documents, in clear life-like representation, the History of the Church of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God and Redeemer of the world, to reproduce her inward and outward fortunes, her conflicts and victories, her sorrows and joys, her thoughts, words and deeds, with ardent love for the truth and broad catholic feeling, and to hold up this picture of eighteen centuries to the view of the present time as the most perfect Defence of Christianity, for instruction and warning, for edification and example:—this is a task, well worthy to engage the best powers of a long life, and carrying with it the largest reward, but at the same time so vast and wide, that its execution, if it is to be in any measure satisfactory, can be reached only by the co-operation of the most various agencies. The single workman, especially one of sub-

ordinate capacity, must count it honor and happiness enough, if he be permitted to contribute some stones merely to the gigantic structure, which in its very nature cannot be completed till the Church shall have reached the goal of her history. For science grows with experience, and becomes ultimately complete only by its means."

—"My plan aims, under the guidance of our Lord's twin parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven, and from the best sources within my reach, to sketch as far as possible a true and graphic picture of the internal and external progress of the Christian Church from its foundation down to our time, for the benefit both theoretically and practically of ministers and theological students, and to aid in this way a proper understanding of the present and a wise hopeful activity for the interests of the future. As regards compass, I propose to steer mid-way, between the synoptical brevity of a mere compend, and the voluminous fullness of a work which seeks to exhaust its subject and is designed simply for the professional scholar. The number of volumes will correspond probably with the periods presented in the General Division. I know too well already however the uncertainty of any such calculation, to lay myself here under any fixed bond in advance, or even to promise absolutely the continuation of the work. The volume now published has turned out much larger than I at first designed. The Apostolical Period however, in view of its fundamental and normative significance, is fairly entitled to a more extensive treatment than the Periods that follow; and it seemed to me necessary moreover to take account directly and indirectly of the late efforts of *Baur* and his school, having for their object, with no small outlay of learning, sagacity and art, a reconstruction of Primitive Christianity, or more properly its destruction—which has had the effect of swelling considerably the number of notes.

"While now my book shows signs on every page of its *German* origin, it is still primarily and immediately designed for *American* readers, and written, so to speak, from an *American*, or more strictly, *Anglo-Germanic* position. I have accordingly had regard more or less to the more important productions of English literature, touching on the same field; and propose in later parts of the work, in case it is continued, to treat of English, Scotch and American Church History at much greater length, than is done usually in German works of the same size. Germany has no lack of books on Ecclesiastical History; even since this volume has been under the press, three valuable new compends have appeared there from *Lindner*, *Fricke* and *Jaco-*



bi—with which however my work, from its difference of plan and size, comes into no conflict. Widely different is the case in America, where it has been the fashion heretofore in almost all Theological Seminaries, as in England also, to rest satisfied with a translation of *Mosheim*. Quite recently however translations also of the works of *Neander* and *Gieseler*, still unfortunately incomplete, are coming to be widely studied, and the time is not far distant, when this energetic restlessly active nation of the future shall do its part likewise in the independent culture and promotion of the science of general church history. Of this we have a guaranty already, in the able contributions that have been made to particular sections of this discipline, as well as in the distinguished success with which several highly gifted Americans have been crowned in the department of profane history. Would that I could do something, in my humble measure, to encourage an impartial study of historical theology in my adopted country, and excite to works that may leave my own far behind! Education and outward position seem to impose it on me as a duty, in this time of critical transition and on this ominous muster field of all the good and bad powers of waning Europe and youthfully fresh America, to labor in the service of German theology for American use, and as far as in me lies to mediate thus between the most theoretical and the most practical of existing nations, between the Greeks and the Romans of the modern world."

We trust the work will find proper patronage and favor. If its circulation be in any sort of proportion to its merits, it cannot fail to be both lasting and wide.

J. W. N.